DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 177 LI 003 812

AUTHOR Schwarzkopf, LeRoy C.
TITLE Regional Libraries and the Depository Library Act of 1962.
PUB DATE Jun 72
NOTE 54p.; (27 References)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Depository Libraries; Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; *Government Publications; *Interlibrary Loans; Library Cooperation; Library Reference Services; Library Services; *Regional Libraries; State Libraries

ABSTRACT

This report is a ten year review of the regional depository library system for federal government documents which was established by the Depository Library Act of 1962. It describes the status of programs which regional libraries have undertaken to comply with the requirements of the Act to "provide interlibrary loan, reference service, and assistance in the disposal of unwanted publications." Also described are the retention policy of regional libraries for materials which they are authorized to discard as an exception to the Act, and the attitude of documents librarians on the desirability of providing federal support to regional depository libraries. The report traces the history of earlier depository library legislation, and analyzes the ten year results of other major changes of the Act of 1962: increase in the number of congressional designations, increase in the number of federal depository libraries, and distribution of non-GPO documents through the depository library system. The report is based on response to a mail questionnaire, visits to selected regional depositories, and the experience of the author who is a regional depository librarian. (Author)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 066177

REGIONAL LIBRARIES

AND

THE DEPOSITORY LIBRARY ACT OF 1962

by

LeRoy C. Schwarzkopf
Government Documents Librarian
University of Maryland

College Park, Maryland
June 1972

LI 003 812

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART		Page
I.	THE DEPOSITORY LIBRARY ACT OF 1962	1
	History of Earlier Legislation	1
	Major Changes in Depository Library Act of 1962	1
	Increase in Number of Congressional Designations	2
	Increase in Number of Federal Depository Libraries	5
	Non-GPO Publications	6
II.	REGIONAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES	7
	Functions of Regional Depository Libraries	7
	Numbers, Types, and Service Area	7
	Organization of the Documents Collection	8
III.	RETENTION POLICY	10
	Bills and Resolutions	10
	Congressional Record	10
	Serial Set, Slip Laws, TIAS, and Census Reports	11
	Loose Leaf Page Changes	12
	Revisions and Ephemeral Materials	12
	Depository Publications in Microfilm	13
	Microforms and GPO	14
	Regional Library Microform Collections and Policy	14
IV.	DISPOSAL POLICY	16
	Law and Implementing Regulations on Disposal	16
	General vs. Detailed List	17
	Initial Processing of Disposal Lists	19
	Geographical Area for Offering Discards	20
	Disposal Statistics	22
	Other Disposal Policy and Problems	22
	Disposal Policy - Conclusions	23
V.	INTERLIBRARY LOAN	25
	Congressional Hearings on Interlibrary Loan	25
	Processing of Interlibrary Loan Requests	25
	Interlibrary Loan Statistics	26
	Restrictions on Interlibrary Loans	26
	Local Circulation of Depository Publications	27
	Augmentation of Collection	27

PART		Page
VI.	REFERENCE ASSISTANCE	29
	1971 SUDOCS Biennial Investigation Report	29
	Periodic Visits by Regionals	30
	Phone and Letter Requests	31
	Assistance on Item Selection	31
	Survey of Selective Depositories	33
	Workshops, Seminars, and Conferences	33
	Newsletters and Announcements	34
	Other Reference Assistance	34
VII.	FEDERAL SUPPORT	35
	Congressional Hearings on Federal Support	35
	Additional Resources Expended by Regionals	36
	Types of Federal Support Recommended	37
	--- Duplicates and Microforms	37
	--- Additional Staff	38
	--- Free Postage for ILL and Disposal Operations	38
	--- Reference Books and Indexes	39
	--- Non-Depository Publications	39
	--- Conducting Workshops, Conferences, etc.	39
	--- Binding	40
	--- Travel Money	40
	FOOTNOTES	41

APPENDIX

A.	QUESTIONNAIRE ON REGIONAL LIBRARIES	A-1
B.	NUMBER OF DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES AS OF APRIL 1972	B-1
C.	NUMBER OF NEW DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES 1962-1972	C-1
D.	LIST OF REGIONAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES	D-1

I. THE DEPOSITORY LIBRARY ACT OF 1962

The year 1972 marked the tenth anniversary of the Depository Library Act of 1962 (PL 87-579; 76 Stat. 352) which was approved August 9,1962. This law represented the first major change in the depository library program for U.S. government documents in forty years. In 1922, the program had been changed to permit a depository library to select only those items which it wanted, rather than having to accept all items offered. (42 Stat. 436)

History of Earlier Legislation. [1]

The depository library program had its origins during the 13th Congress, 2d session when by resolution of December 27, 1813 (3 Stat. 141) Congress authorized 200 additional copies of certain documents printed for distribution "for every future Congress" to state and territorial governments, and to certain academic institutions and historical societies. The present system of depository libraries is considered to have been established in the late 1850's when by joint resolution of January 28, 1857 (11 Stat. 253) which was further amended by joint resolution of March 20, 1858 (11 Stat. 368) the practice of designating depository libraries was formalized. Each representative or delegate was authorized to designate one library within his district or territory. By Act of February 5, 1859 (11 Stat. 380) Congress extended the designation privilege to each Senator, and assigned the program to the Secretary of the Interior.

The General Printing Act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 611) transferred responsibility for the depository library system from the Department of the Interior to the Government Printing Office, where the program has since been administered by The Superintendent of Documents. The following types of libraries had also been specifically designated by law without regard to location: (1) state libraries, one per state; (2) all land grant college libraries (34 Stat. 1014); (3) libraries of the executive departments, one per department; (4) service academy libraries; and (5) other special designations.

Another landmark was the Act of June 23, 1913 (38 Stat. 75) which provided that once a depository was designated, that designation could not be removed involuntarily without cause. This was designed to remove the program from a "spoils system" whereby a Congressman might arbitrarily cancel a designation to appoint a favored library of his choice. With redistricting, this has also resulted in an excess of representative designated depositories in some districts.

Major Changes In Depository Library Act of 1962.

The main change in the Depository Library Act of 1962 was that which authorized the establishment of the regional libraries. This also included a provision whereby selective depositories could discard any depository publication which they had held at least five years, with the permission of the regional library. This report is concerned specifically with the status of the regional library program ten years after the enactment of this law: how the responsibilities of regional libraries are

interpreted, and what programs the regional libraries are conducting to fulfill these responsibilities. It is based on an analysis of responses to a mail questionnaire sent to all regional libraries (attached as Appendix A), review of the literature, and personal visits to regional libraries. Completed questionnaires were received from 34 regional libraries. The author is himself the documents librarian at a regional library where he has been personally involved with the program for nearly five years. However, before proceding to the principal investigation of this report, a brief review will be made of other major changes to the depository library program by the 1962 law.

In addition to the establishment of the regional libraries, the other major changes resulting from the Depository Library Act of 1962 include the following:

a. Increased the number of Congressional designations by each representative and senator from 1 to 2. This theoretically increased the possible number of such designations by 485 libraries. The increase was limited to 443 libraries since, due to redistricting, 42 districts had already filled their full new quota of two representative designations. [2]

b. Increased the number of depository designations from one per each executive department to such additional depository libraries within the executive departments and independent agencies which would not exceed the number of major bureaus or divisions of such departments and agencies. A maximum number of 250 possible depositories was originally estimated as falling within this category. [3]

c. Authorized the distribution of non-GPO publications within the depository library program. Previously the program had as a practical matter been limited to publications printed by, or under the supervision of the Government Printing Office. [4]

Increase in Number of Congressional Designations.

The major change which the promoters of the Depository Library Act of 1962 desired was an increase in the authorized number of congressional designations. The most critical problem was claimed to be the need for additional depositories. [5] This situation occurred despite the fact that in 1962 there were 126 existing vacancies, of which 116 were congressional designations. However, the vacancies did not exist where the depository designations were desired, or needed. The main fault appeared at that time to be (and still does) basing the program on the representative district.

The number of representatives is limited by law to 435. This theoretically limits the number of such designations now to 870. Since the law does not authorize an increase in the total number of representatives due to population changes, no increases had been authorized in the number of representative designations as the population increased. After each decennial population census, the number of representatives are reapportioned among the states. Thus, in actual practice, a limited number of additional depository designations may be created by each redistricting due to provision of the law which prohibits withdrawal

of a depository designation involuntarily without cause. On the other hand a previously unused designation may be lost by such redistricting.

Another contributing factor is the wide disparity in population among congressional districts, and the fact that educational institutions and other important library facilities are not uniformly scattered throughout the districts.[6] In 1962 the population of the districts ranged from a low of 177,431 (12th Michigan) to a high of 1,014,460 (28th California). The 1970 Census of Population showed a range of a low of 288,482 (2d North Dakota) to a high of 871,862 (35th California).[7]

The academic library has become increasingly important in the depository library system. At present, academic libraries account for a total of 66% of all depository libraries. Academic libraries accounted for 70% of all depository libraries designated since 1962.

In order to accomodate this disadvantage of tying the number of depositories to specific geographical areas (congressional districts), the American Library Association representatives proposed at the Senate subcommittee hearings in 1962 that additional senatorial designations should be authorized for each state, based on population.[8] It was hoped that this would help to achieve the desired amount of flexibility within the program. This proposal was not incorporated into the 1962 law.

In 1972, a total of 1,341 depositories were authorized by esixting law. This figure may be understated since it is based on an estimated number of 125 depositories for executive departments and independent agencies and their major bureaus or divisions.[9] The total number of depository libraries designated in April 1972 by type and locations are shown in Appendix B. The total number of new depository libraries which have been designated since 1962 is shown in Appendix C, broken down by type and location.

One of the most significant facts which emerges from the figures in Appendixes B and C is the extent to which the academic library dominants the depository library system. It would appear that the system is deviating from its stated purpose of making "government publications available for the free use of the general public". (44 U.S.C. 1911) Its main purpose now appears to be support of higher education.

Another significant fact about these figures is the extent to which the original estimates for the number of new depositories was grossly underestimated on one hand (for congressional designations), and on the other hand was grossly overestimated (for federal agency designations). As for congressional designations, the Senate subcommittee appeared to place a great deal of confidence in the estimate made by Clifton Brock as reported in his article, "The Federal Depository System; a Proposal for Change".[10] This article was republished in the appendix of the hearings.[11] Brock's study was made before the bill was amended to authorize an additional designation for each Senator.

Brock concluded that the number of new representative designations would not reach the theoretical total of 435, but would be limited to 342 new depositories, and that "it was extremely unlikely that the total

number would be higher than 244 ... but a realistic estimate would seem to place the probable number of new depositories somewhere between 100 and 150." [12] Brock based his analysis on the now discredited assumption "that a district which has not taken advantage of its depository privilege under present law is extremely unlikely to take advantage of additional opportunity under the proposed law." [13]

Brock also discounted as "unrealistic" the proposal that each district which already has one authorized depository would wish to add an additional one. This is true in some cases. However, his primary example of the 6th Alabama district to illustrate this point shows the fallacy of this study. He concluded that the most likely candidates for the added designation were a medium size public library and a small college library. He felt that neither would wish to become a depository, and in fact apparently neither did.[14] The designation has since been taken by the University of Alabama Law School Library. The University of Alabama Main Library already had the representative designation for that district, and is now a regional library. This was an unforseen element, but certainly not a surprising development when one considers the large amount of legal materials available through the depository system.

In addition to the University of Alabama, 24 other law school libraries gained depository status since 1962. Three bills have also been introduced in the 92d Congress which would authorize every accredited law school to obtain depository status, if it so desired.[15] The Superintendent of Documents estimated the number of libraries in this category to be approximately 300. [16]

Another development which Brock and others may not have foreseen is the extent to which junior and community college libraries wished to become depositories (27 new depositories since 1962). Seven of the nine state libraries which became new depositories since 1962 also used congressional designations. Each state is authorized only one designation by law for a state library. However, a state may have three or four libraries which qualify for that designation: state (or supreme court) law library; state historical society; state library commission (usually associated with the state department of education); state branch library dictated by geography; or a multi-purpose state library.

A Senate bill (S.2227) which would authorize the library of each state's highest appellate court to be designated as a depository passed the Senate on July 16, 1971. The bill is still in House committee. Four such libraries are presently depositories and have used the state library designation. In three of these states, the state library had to use a congressional designation to obtain depository status.[17]

The situation in 1972 is again approaching the critical and paradoxial stage it did ten years ago. There are a number of libraries which wish, and deserve to acquire depository status, but are unable to, due to a lack of congressional vacancies in their district and/or state. Meanwhile, there are 195 vacancies elsewhere (22 senatorial, and 173 representative) which in many cases cannot be effectively assigned. The same solution has been proposed in 1972 that was proposed a decade earlier: increase the number of representative designations. Five identical bills

sponsored by 48 representatives have been introduced in the 92d Congress to increase the number of representative designations from two to three for each district.[18]

Thirty six sponsors of these bills have used up their representative designations. Nine sponsors still have one vacancy each, and three sponsors have two vacancies each. However, the problem is most vividly portrayed in the district of one of the sponsors. The Rhode Island second district already has seven depository libraries, which apparently are not enough for that particular district. These libraries used the following types of designations: two representative, three senatorial, one land grant college, and one state library designation. Meanwhile, the neighboring first Rhode Island district has vacant its full quota of two representative designations. The district of one other sponsor has also used three senatorial designations in addition to its allotted two representative designations (Hawaii second district).

However, there is another factor which aggravates this situation as it did in 1962. There are a number of depositories which do not deserve the designation; but there is a reluctance for them to voluntarily give, or be forced to give it up. Some of the newly designated depositories probably fall into this category and compound the problem. An Illinois State Library Survey in 1971 showed that 9% of the Illinois depositories had selected 10% or less of the items offered by the Superintendent of Documents, and 44% had selected 25% or less of the items.[19] These results were similar to those of the Powell Report of 1956 which indicated that at that time 12% of the depositories selected 10% or less of the items offered, and 24% selected 25% or less of the items.[20] I feel that any depository which selects fewer than 10% of the items is wasting that designation and should have it withdrawn, and that any depository which selects fewer than 25% of the available items should have the quality of its selections investigated to determine if the depository serves the public need.[21]

Increase in Number of Federal Depository Libraries.

The number of new depositories of independent agencies, and of major bureaus and divisions of executive departments and agencies has fallen below expectations. It was estimated that the number would fall between 25 and 250. After ten years the minimum figure has not yet been reached. The libraries of only five independent agencies, and of 18 major bureaus or divisions of the executive department have become depositories. The Superintendent of Documents has since reduced the estimated total possible to 125. However, I feel that this figure is too low when one considers the type of Department of Defense libraries which have taken advantage of this provision (post general libraries, military school libraries, etc). The Federal Library Committee has compiled a directory which lists over 1,900 federal libraries.[22] No effort has been made to determine how many of these libraries would qualify for depository status if they wished it.

The fact that not many federal libraries wish to become depositories is a welcome development, since this type of depository again fails to serve the basic purpose of the law which is to make government documents of public interest or educational value available for the free use of the general public. The Public Printer pointed this out when the bill was

considered, and suggested that this provision was designed merely as an "easy means" for agencies to acquire publications on automatic distribution from a central source.[23] This conclusion was verified by the witness for the Executive Department at the Senate hearings. He testified that the main reason for wanting this provision was to obtain one-stop service for easily obtaining government publications of other agencies for use of their own agency personnel.[24] The federal depository libraries were further placed outside of the regular depository system when they were authorized to dispose of unwanted publications by offering them to the Library of Congress or the National Archives, rather than requesting permission of the regional libraries. (44 U.S.C. 1907) A curious fact about the subsequent history of this provision is that the Library of Congress has not requested depository status.

Non-GPO Publications.

Another significant change in the Depository Library Act of 1962 was that provision which authorized the distribution of non-GPO publications through the depository library system. This part of the program has not been very well funded or supported. Ten years later, only three executive departments are participating to a very limited extent in the program. Only 62 non-GPO items are available for selection as follows: Bureau of the Census (20 items); Department of the Interior (12 items); and Department of Labor (32 items).[25]

The law has several basic weaknesses which prevent it from achieving any degree of success. Those publications can be exempted from depository distribution which are determined by their issuing agency to be "required for official use only or for strictly administrative purposes." (44 U.S.C. 1902) The law provides little incentive for issuing agencies to declare their publications eligible for depository distribution, since it requires that they (rather than the Government Printing Office which administers the program) should pay the cost of publications provided, plus the cost of shipping to the GPO warehouse. GPO is required to pay only for the handling and distribution costs once they have been received at its warehouse. (44 U.S.C. 1903)

The library profession may have underestimated the number of non-GPO publications produced and the difficulty in making them available, and overestimated their value to libraries. I think that a better analysis of the situation will be found in the testimony of Mr. James Harrison (former Public Printer) before the Senate subcommittee in 1962 than in the comments of librarians in the library literature. Mr. Harrison had previously been a staff member of the Joint Committee on Printing, and stated the problem as follows:

> "Someone has got to get in there with a pitchfork, and it literally amounts to that when you see these (non-GPO) publications.[26] ... I just can't imagine the total amount of the number of publications that would be printed by the field printing system that we are talking about here. It is just astronomical.[27] ... I think that an evaluation has to be made as to whether there is enough to make the tremendous effort worldwide in separating the few grains of wheat from the many mountains of chaff." [28] (italics mine)

II. REGIONAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES.

Functions of Regional Depository Libraries.

The Depository Library Act of 1962 prescribes the additional functions of the regional depositories as follows: they "shall receive from the Superintendent of Documents copies of all new and revised Government publications authorized for distribution to depository libraries" ... and they will "retain at least one copy of all Government publications either in printed or microfacsimile form (except those authorized to be discarded by the Superintendent of Documents); and within the region served will provide interlibrary loan, reference service, and assistance in the disposal of unwanted Government publications." (44 U.S.C. 1912)

The survey included four major parts directly related to the functions listed above: retention policy, disposal policy, interlibrary loan, and reference assistance. Two additional parts of the survey were devoted to questions of general administrative information, and federal support. The latter subject was considered as a major issue in the earlier hearings by the House subcommittee in 1957 and 1958. [1] This report covers those six parts in the order in which they were listed on the questionnaire (copy attached as Appendix A). The report will frequently refer to questions by the number used on that questionnaire.

Numbers, Types, and Service Area.

By the spring of 1972, 41 depository libraries located in 35 states had accepted the added responsibilities of a regional library. A list of these regional libraries will be found in Appendix D. They included the following types of libraries: 22 academic, 15 state, and 4 public.

Each state is authorized to have two regional depositories, which is the situation in seven states. However, these seven states are not necessarily those with the largest number of depositories. The three states with the largest number have only one regional library: California with 84, New York with 68, and Ohio with 50 depositories. On the other extreme, Arizona with nine, and New Mexico with only seven depositories have two regionals each. One of the three Nevada depositories is a regional library.

It had been anticipated that some of the smaller states might join together and be served by one regional. This has been done in two cases. The University of Maine Library serves not only the nine other depositories in its own state, but also the eight depositories in Vermont, and the eight depositories in neighboring New Hampshire. The Denver Public Library shares responsibility for serving Colorado depositories with the University of Colorado, and also serves the seven depository libraries in Wyoming. However, this is a temporary situation until a Wyoming depository assumes the regional responsibilities in that state. It appears that similar arrangement might be made in several other cases. For example, the eight non-federal depositories in Rhode Island might be served by the regional depository in either neighboring Connecticut or Massachusetts. The five depository libraries in Delaware and the three

depositories in the District of Columbia which are not libraries of federal government agencies might be served by the regional library in Maryland.

Two of the regional libraries share their responsibilities with another nearby library: Wisconsin State Historical Society with the University of Wisconsin, and North Dakota State University with the University of North Dakota.

When one includes the depositories which serve two or more states, 37 of the 50 states are provided regional library service. Depository libraries in those states which are not served by a regional are required to retain permanently all depository publications, with only those exceptions granted to regional libraries. This does not include the depository libraries of federal government agencies which are authorized to request disposal instructions from the Library of Congress or the National Archives.

Although the three states with the largest number of depositories have only one regional library, it is believed that such states could justify the need for more than the maximum of two regionals authorized by law. During the House hearings in 1957 and 1958 the opinion was expressed that some of the larger states might need three or more regionals, while the smaller states might need only one, or might join cooperatively with several adjoining states to be served by one regional library.[2] In the three large states mentioned, the regional library is a state library of the multi-purpose type. It is believed that these three state libraries form the apex of a state wide general library regional service, and they therefore may consider the regional library depository service to be an integral part of this general library service. The intent of the 1962 law was that the regional depository library network would include only the other depositories in the region, and not all other non-depository libraries.

In those states which have two regional depositories, the division of responsibilities has been based primarily on geographic location. However, in one state in which one of the regionals is an academic library and the other a public library, this division of responsibility has been partially based on type of library.

Organization of Documents Collection.

The regional libraries were asked in question 7 of the questionnaire to describe how their documents collection was organized. Of the 34 responding libraries, the results were as follows: separate collection - 17; integrated collection - 2; and separate, partially integrated collection - 15. Those libraries which answered that their collection was partially integrated were asked to provide a rough estimate in percentages of the number of titles in the separate and integrated parts of the collection, and the amount of shelf space occupied by each part. The average for those responding was that approximately 85% of the titles were located in the separate part of the collection, and they occupied 85% of the total shelf space.

An earlier survey with the same question which was directed only to the 22 academic regional libraries[3] resulted in what I consder to be a more realistic figure: 85% of the titles were located in the separate part of the collection, and they occupied only 60% of the total shelf space. The type of titles which are normally integrated into the general library collection are voluminous serials in bound volumes; for example, the Congressional Record which is a single title occupies a considerable amount of shelf space and is a prime candidate for integration.

The survey did not ask what kind of titles were integrated. At the University of Maryland, a regional library, the following types of items are integrated into the general library collection:

(1) Periodicals.

(2) Monograph series, such as:

(a) Numbered publications in series which use a simple consecutive numbering system (ex. Department of Agriculture departmental series, Bureau of Labor Statistics Bulletins, etc.)

(b) Decisions/Opinions of Courts and Administrative or Regulatory Agencies (ex. U.S. Reports, I.C.C. Reports, Internal Revenue Bulletin, etc.)

(c) Other legal materials (ex. Federal Register, Code of Federal Regulations, U.S. Code, U.S. Treaties, etc.)

(3) Annual reports of executive departments and independent agencies.

(4) Significant yearbooks and annual statistical compilations.

(5) Final bound census reports.

The survey also did not ask what type of organization the regional documents librarians consider most appropriate for a permanent collection. In his Instructions to Depository Libraries, the Superintendent of Documents recommends that depository publications "should receive the same care and treatment as privately published materials, such as books and periodicals. They need not be held together as a special depository collection."[4] These Instructions make no distinction between regional and selective depositories on the manner in which they organize their collection. However, since the collection of a regional library is the permanent one for its region, I feel that the security and integrity of the collection should be given full consideration, and these might be better served by a separate collection. However, the author administers a partially integrated collection as indicated above, and feels that this method is otherwise preferred for handling a large documents collection.

III. RENTENTION POLICY.

The second part of the survey considered the retention policy of the regional depositories. The regional library has the permanent documents collection for its region . The survey attempted to determine if this had any effect on its retention policy for those categories of items which it was authorized to discard in accordance with section 11 of the Instructions to Depository Libraries.[1]

Following the mailing of the questionnaire, it was learned that the Superintendent of Documents had transferred the library previously maintained in the Public Documents Department to the National Archives. By agreement between the Public Printer and the Archivist of the United States the collection was transferred as an archival unit, and will retain its present SuDocs classification scheme. This should make the collection, which will remain intact, more accessible to researchers than heretofore.

In general, it may be concluded that the fact the regional library has the permanent collection for its region did not alter in any way its retention policy with regard to the items mentioned. If the regional chose to retain any materials which it was authorized to discard, it did so only for local reasons to better serve its own clientelle, or in some cases to provide duplicates or circulation copies for interlibrary loan. The results of the answers to these questions are discussed below, since they have application to other depository libraries.

Bills and Resolutions.

In response to question 11, "do you retain bills and resolutions more than one year beyond the close of the Congress?", 18 regionals answered "yes" and 16 answered "no". However, of those answering "yes", only four libraries indicated how long they kept them. (The questionnaire should have specifically requested this information.) Three of these libraries answered "two years", which is the length of one Congress; i.e. these libraries apparently kept the bills of only two Congresses, the current one and the past one. The other library replied that it kept bills for the past five Congresses. Two academic regional libraries replied that the law school libraries on their campus retained bills of past Congresses. Another regional reported that it depended on the Center for Research Libraries for old bills and resolutions.

Of the sixteen libraries which indicated that they did not keep bills beyond the required retention period, all replied that they did not get a microfilm edition of them. The Library of Congress has a project to copy bills of past Congresses on microfilm. It has microfilmed the bills of all Congresses through the 65th, and apparently intends to bring this service up to date. This is one type of document which lends itself to microform copy and use. These old bills are useful in tracing legislation. However, considering the large number of bills on which there is no action, and large number of identical bills, it is very space consuming to save the entire set for those few bills which may be needed later. One commendable thing which negates this

requirement is the frequent practice of reproducing the bills in the published hearings which consider them.

Congressional Record.

In response to question 10, "do you retain all, or part of the daily Congressional Record after the bound volumes have been received?", only three regionals answered "yes". Unfortunately, they did not explain which parts they kept, or for how long. (The questionnaire should have requested this information.) However, I have visited one of the libraries which answered "yes", and it was observed that this library had retained the daily Congressional Record for at least the past ten Congresses. The documents librarian indicated that these older daily editions had been used to verify differences with the final bound volume. Congressmen may, of course, edit their remarks before publication.

The general response to this question was that most regional libraries retained all of the daily copies of a volume until the bound index parts appeared. The paging in the daily edition is, of course, different from that in the bound volume. Several depositories specifically indicated that in the past they had retained the appendix of the daily edition since these were not republished in the final bound volumes. However, with the start of the 90th Congress, 1st session in 1967, the "Extension of Remarks" (appendix) section has been republished in the bound volumes. Prior to this, a library which discarded the appendix might obtain this material on microfilm from the Library of Congress.

Serial Set, Slip Laws, TIAS, and Census Reports.

In response to question 11, "do you retain advance copies of any of the following (i.e. Congressional reports and documents, slip laws, TIAS, and preliminary census reports) which are later superseded by bound volumes?", the general concensus was that regional libraries do not retain these materials, except as indicated below for specific items.

With respect to Congressional reports and documents which are later superseded by the Serial Set, 11 regionals answered a qualified "yes", namely that they might retain selectively for more important publications. Although they did not specifically identify these publications, it is suspected that in most cases they were "documents" rather than "reports", probably such titles or series as the debate topics, inaugaral addresses, etc. However, one regional replied that it retained all of them.

With respect to slip laws which are later superseded by the Statutes at Large, 10 regionals reported that they retained these. Four of these "yes" answers were qualified by the remark: "a few", "some", and/or "selectively". Slip laws contain a brief legislative history which is not republished in the Statutes. With respect to Treaties and Other International Acts Series (TIAS) which are superseded by U.S. Treaties, 10 libraries replied that they retained these.

With respect to preliminary census reports, which are later superseded by final bound reports, six libraries answered with an unqualified

"yes", and 11 other libraries answered with a qualified "yes", the qualification being they limited their retention to reports pertaining to the local area, state, or region only.

It appears that the main reason a depository might retain the advance copies of these materials is to have duplicate copies available for circulation. Retention of the advance copies provides certain advantages for circulation and interlibrary loan, and even for use within the library. The bound volumes incorporate tens and hundreds of individual reports, documents, laws, treaties, and state or subject census reports in one volume. Usually a researcher needs to consult only one of the smaller publications within the larger bound volume. In the case of interlibrary loan, using an advance copy will reduce the postage charges and will limit the number of individual publications which must be removed from the library, and therefore not available for use locally during the loan period.

Loose Leaf Page Changes.

In response to question 12, "do you file loose leaf page changes?", only one regional replied "no". However, nine of those which answered "yes" qualified their answer by the general comment that this was limited to only "important" or "heavily used" documents. It is suspected that the remaining "yes" answers should be qualified by this remark. It is inconceivable to me that many depositories, whether or not they are regionals, are interfiling loose-leaf page changes for the many Army Regulations and Federal Item Identification Guides which are being issued. The superseded pages may, of course, be discarded after the revised pages have been interfiled.

Revisions and Ephemeral Materials.

In response to question 13, "do you retain older editions of publications which have been revised or superseded by new editions?", the general concensus is that regional libraries do not retain these materials. However, 7 regionals answered an unqualified "yes". Nineteen regionals answered this question with a qualified "yes", or listed major exceptions. The major exception is for those publications which might have historical value or interest. This is, of course, a subjective determination and might vary widely with each librarian. The historical value of older editions of a publication may not become apparent until years after they have been discarded for new editions. How many depositories, for example, have retained all editions of Children's Bureau publication number 8, Infant Care?

The response to question 14 about retention of "annual or biennial publications of a statistical nature which merely revise figures or information and bring them up to date" appeared meaningless. This is probably due to the fact most librarians don't know what publications belong in this category. The Superintendent of Documents provides two examples in his Instructions to Depository Libraries: Index of Specifications and Standards, and Light Lists. Both of these examples, and indeed this entire category might be better considered to fall under the general category of "revisions".

In response to question 15, "do you retain material which has an expiring effect date, such as Civil Service examination announcements, self expiration date circulars, etc.?", the general concensus was that regional libraries do not retain these ephemeral materials permanently. However, there were 7 regionals which replied an unqualified "yes" to this question, and two a "yes" qualified by the remark "some". Liekwise in response to question 16, "do you retain the daily House calendar other than the final volume?", the general concensus was that regional libraries keep only the current issue, and possibly the latest Monday issue since it contains a subject index. However, 7 regionals did answer "yes" to this question. One of these regionals replied that it planned to discard them in the future, while another replied that it kept only those for "the most recent Congresses."

Depository Publications in Microform.

The survey questionnaire also asked several questions about the policy of regional libraries on microforms. In the early 1950's, the Superintendent of Documents authorized all depositories to substitute microfacsimile copy for any depository publications provided they were properly referenced and located so as to be readily accessible to use, and provided also that the necessary reading equipment was available. This was one of the first major breakthroughs for depository libraries to discard certain types of materials which may have been little used, or required large amounts of space.

This discarding is, of course, limited by the type and extent of materials available in microform. The bulk of these available materials have been those published by the Readex Microprint Corporation in two main series: Congressional Serial Set which is now available through 1913 (62d Congress), and Depository Documents set which is published currently and is available back to 1956. Several voluminous and space consuming serials are available in microform from several publishers: i.e. Debates and Proceedings of Congress (Congressional Record and its predecessors) and the Federal Register.

Current Congressional hearings became available on microfiche in 1970 from the Congressional Information Service (CIS). In addition, Greenwood Publishing Company has undertaken a major project to make all earlier hearings available on microfiche. Hearings through the 83d Congress (1954) are available from this publisher. Hearings were not generally available as depository items prior to 1938. Greenwood Publishing Company has also undertaken a project to make older Census reports available on microfiche. Current reports of the 1970 Censuses of Population and Housing are being made available on microfiche by the National Technical Information Service.

All of these are examples of rather voluminous materials which occupy a considerable amount of shelf space in hard copy, and which would provide a savings in space if held only in microform. Other depository publications are available in microform. Most of these will be found listed under the "U.S" entries in Guide to Microforms in Print.[2]

Microforms and GPO.

The question and problem of microforms occupied a key role in the hearings on the Depository Library Act of 1962. The bill as introduced in 1957 contained the provision that regional depositories would retain "two or more copies .. either printed, microprinted, or microfilm form" of all depository publications. (H.R. 9186, 85th Congress). The witnesses representing the library profession objected to this provision, testifying that two copies were not needed for all publications, and that this requirement would result in doubling the amount of storage space needed at a substantial increased cost.[4] As a result, the requirement for retention of two copies was deleted.

When the bill was again introduced in 1962 (H.R. 8141, 87th Congress), it required that regional libraries would permanently retain one copy of each publication (either hard copy or microform). In addition to receiving one copy of every new and revised depository publication, the regional libraries would "be entitled to receive a microfacsimile copy of those Government publications which the Superintendent of Documents determines to be suitable for such form of reproduction and can be furnished by him within the limit of available appropriations." The intent of this provision was that regional libraries would be provided microforms of older, voluminous, and/or little used materials which they might then discard in order to save space. However, the Public Printer and the Superintendent of Documents were opposed to this provision and caused it to be stricken from the bill before passage. The reasons for their opposition included the following: lack of standardization among microforms, lack of in-house capability at GPO to produce microforms, and added cost to the government.

Barely ten years later in 1971 the Public Printer and Superintendent of Documents did an 180 degree turn and proposed their own microform publishing program. However, this program would provide microform copies of new and revised publications which would be distributed in lieu of the more expensive printed copies at a cheaper cost per copy.[5] The present GPO microform publishing program is being promoted as a cost saver- to the government.[6] The 1962 proposal on the other hand was intended to be a cost, and space saver for the depository libraries, specifically the new regional depositories.

Regional Library Microform Collections and Policy.

In response to question 17 regarding microform collections, only four regional libraries replied that they did <u>not</u> have some collections of government publications in microform. In addition to the microforms of depository materials mentioned above, the following items were also mentioned: <u>Department of State Newsletter</u>, and <u>Official Gazette</u>. Many non-depository documents collections in microform were also mentioned: Readex Microprint Corporation non-depository documents (published currently and available back to 1953), JPRS translations in microfilm, NASA technical reports, AEC technical reports, ERIC research reports, Patent specifications, National Archives microfilms, Library of Congress collections of Presidential Papers in microfilm, etc.

The answers to question 18, "do you discard the paper copy of documents which are reproduced on the microform edition?", did not reveal any discernable policy by regional libraries. As a general rule, regionals do not automatically discard their original hard copy of materials which they also have in microform. They consider each situation individually, taking into consideration the following factors: amount of shelf space available, condition of the materials, and amount or type of documents.

Several depositories specifically indicated that they discard their hard copy of the Federal Register and Official Gazette. On the other hand, several regionals specifically indicated that they retain their original copies of the 19th century Serial Set unless they are in bad condition. Another depository mentioned that it keeps some original copies as back up for loan purposes, which is probably true for other regionals. Several regionals indicated that their microform collections do not duplicate material available in hard copy. This is also probably true of other regionals, since older materials are often available only in microform editions.

The 1971 Bienniel Investigation Report of the Superintendent of Documents also asked several questions regarding the use of microforms by depository libraries. These questions were directed to all the depository libraries, and not just to the regional libraries. The response to the questions was as follows: [7]

45. "The present law permits all depository libraries to substitute microfacsimile copies of any holdings of U. S. Government publications providing they are properly referenced and can be readily located. Has your library taken advantage of this privilege?" Yes 294. No 749. Did not answer 8.

46. "What was the purpose of this replacement?"

    (a) For preservation. 28
    (b) For conservation of space. 193
    (c) Combination of the above. 96
    Did not answer. 7

IV. DISPOSAL POLICY.

One of the most significant provisions of the Depository Library Act of 1962 was that which authorized regional libraries to permit the selective depositories within their region (less libraries of federal agencies) to discard any depository publication after holding it for at least five years. Before this time, all depositories were required to hold their depository publications permanently, except those types of revisions or advance copies mentioned above, and those for which a microform copy had been substituted.

Law and Implementing Regulations on Disposal.

The specific provisions of the law are as follows:

> "... regional depositories may permit depository libraries within the areas served by them, to dispose of Government publications which they have retained for five years after offering them to other depository libraries within their area, then to other libraries." (44 U.S.C. 1912)

The following implementing instructions were issued to regional libraries by the Superintendent of Documents in his Special Instruction to Regional Depositories, dated November 7, 1962:

> "Upon request for such permission (to dispose of depository publications) we suggest you ask for a list of the publications showing the current item number, series, title, and approximate extent of the holdings for which permission is requested. ... In the actual disposition of other than ephemeral publications we suggest you instruct them (the requesting depository) along the following lines: That the publications be offered to some other public library or educational institution in their vicinity which would be able to make them available to the public and to which they might refer requests for their use. Failing to find such a taker after reasonable effort they may dispose of them in any appropriate manner... " (italics mine)[1]

The following implementing instructions directed to all depositories are contained in the Superintendent of Documents Instructions to Depository Libraries, revised September 1967:

> "Depository libraries which are served by regional depositories may dispose of publications which they have retained for at least five years with the permission of and in accordance with instructions from the regional depository which serves their area." [2]

This part of the survey sought to determine how the regional libraries interpreted and implemented the law and the instructions from the Superintendent of Documents. As will be seen below, the main differences in policy concerned the following: (1) whether a detailed or a general list of unwanted publications was required; (2) the geographical extent to which takers for the discarded publications were sought;

and (3) whether the offerings to other libraries were made by the regional or by the selective depositories.

In response to question 19, "have you issued implementing instructions in the form of a guide, pamphlet, letter, etc. which has been distributed to your selective depositories?", 19 regionals replied "yes" of which 15 enclosed a copy of these instructions with their reply. A similar question was asked by the Superintendent of Documents on his 1971 Biennial Investigation Report to which 33 regionals replied that they had prepared specific disposal instructions, and 8 regionals replied that they had not.[3]

General vs. Detailed Disposal List.

In response to question 20, "are you satisfied with a general list of the approximate holdings on the initial application, or do you initially require a detailed list by individual title or numbered publication in a series?", 6 regionals replied that they required only a general list, while 21 regionals replied that they required a detailed list. Two other regionals replied that they required something between the two extremes; two regionals replied that they had not received any requests as yet; and the remainder did not answer. It is this subject of the type of list which must be submitted (general vs. detailed) which probably causes the most misunderstanding between the regionals and the selective depositories and the Superintendent of Documents.

The law does not specifically state that a list is required. Indeed the law is not clear as to whether the selective depository must even offer the discards to the regional if it is not within its district. Does the term "within their area" in the law refer to the area of the regional depository, or to the area of the selective depository?

The concept of requiring the selective depository to submit a list to the regional library arose from the implementing instructions which the Superintendent of Documents addressed to regional depositories in his Special Instruction of November 7, 1962. In that letter, the Superintendent of Documents "suggested" (but did not require) that a regional library should ask for a list of the publications which the selective depository wished to discard. He further "suggested" that this list should be a general list, and should show current item number, series title, and approximate extent of the holdings. He also "suggested" that the depository be instructed to offer the publications to other libraries "in their vicinity". This would lead one to believe that the "area" in which the discarded publications should be offered as prescribed by the law was the area in the vicinity of the selective depository. Such an immediate area could be considered to be the congressional district.

In his Instructions to Depository Libraries, the Superintendent of Documents does not mention either a list or the offering area, but states that publications over five years old may be discarded "with the permission and in accordance with instructions from the regional depository which serves their area". However, in the preceding para-

graph, when discussing disposal of revisions and advance opies of publications, or publications for which a microform copy had been substituted, he states that they should be offered to other libraries in the "immediate vicinity".

When asked to clarify these apparent discrepancies between the law and his implementing instructions on the requirement for a list, and the geographical extent of the offering area, the Superintendent of Documents stated that he adhered "to the policy of permitting the Regionals to exercise the widest possible latitude in their operations." [4] As for requiring a list of the publications, he stated that "I do not feel that a list of the material to be disposed of need be supplied to the Regional, or submitted to other depositories unless it would provide information that is needed by the Regional. It can be left to the discretion of each Regional and if not deemed necessary, disposition can be authorized without specific list." [5]

The Superintendent of Documents is usually the target for criticism when the preparation of an excessively detailed list is required. Such criticism is directed at the wrong target.

As for the use of the terms "in the vicinity" and "area" as used in his instructions, the Superintendent of Documents agreed that this "has been intended to mean the immediate vicinity--keeping the documents as close to the point of their original receiption as possible." [6] However, again adhering to his policy of permitting the regionals to have the widest possible latitude, he stated that "there would seem no reason why a Regional should not, at its discretion, permit disposition anywhere in the area served by it." [7] Unfortunately, he did not at this time clarify whether the term "their area" in the law itself, referred to the area of the regional or the selective depository.

It would appear to me that the main reason a list may be required is to make an offering of the publications to other libraries. Thus, such a list need be prepared only in such detail as is needed for a prospective taker to identify the materials. In submitting the list first to the regional, a selective depository is actually making an offer. The regional may therefore initially require what it considers to be sufficient detail for it to screen the list against its holdings to determine if it wishes to take any of the publications. Another factor which may influence the amount of detail which the regional requires in the initial list is whether the regional, or the holding library will make the subsequent offerings. If the regional mails out the offering lists, it will usually canvas the entire region, and often out-of-state libraries as well, and will want an offering list in sufficient detail for a wide range of prospective takers to be able to identify the materials.

The main problem, and time consuming part in preparing a detailed list concerns the general publications, hearings, and other documents which use as a book number a cuttered number or a complicated numbering system. A detailed list can be easily prepared for annual reports (or serials), publications in numbered series with a simple numbering

system (unless the title is wanted for each number), periodicals, and similar serials with a volume and/or issue number. A general listing of hearings or general publications might appear as follows if prepared according to the suggestions of the Superintendent of Documents:

Item No.	Series Title (approximate holdings)	SuDocs No.
10	General publications (92 pieces dating 1923 to 1967)	A1.2:
1017	Committee on Foreign Affairs House (123 hearings dating 1938 to 1967)	Y4.F76/1:

A full detailed listing would require several pages for each item above, and would include the title, date, and SuDocs number for each of the 92 general publications and each of the 123 hearings.

Initial Processing of Disposal Lists.

In response to question 21, "do you first screen the (discard) list and take pieces which you wish to add to your collection, including duplicates?", all the regionals replied that they did. In submitting the list to the regional for approval, the holding library is actually offering the materials first to the regional library. One regional librarian commented that one of the few advantages in being a regional was that it got first chance at any discards within the region. The regional is in fact obligated to screen the lists and to take all publications on the list which it does not already have in its collection. This also provides the regional an opportunity to pick up any duplicates which it feels it may need of more heavily used publications.

In response to question 22, "do you visit the library to inspect the items on the list(s)?", only five regionals replied that they did. The number of depository libraries served, their distances, as well as the number and type of publications, may be determining factors in this matter.

It is my general policy to require only a general list initially and to visit the depository to inspect the materials. This policy is feasible in a smaller, densely populated state like Maryland. The number of depositories is not large, and most of them are located within a radius of 50 miles. I feel that making such visits has several advantages for both the regional and the depository. Action on the disposal process can begin with a general list, rather than having the holding library initially compile a time consuming detailed list. The items can be identified better to determine what materials are involved.

There has usually been little uniformity in lists which have been submitted. This is usually due to the manner in which the records are kept by the depository. The list may be in shelf list order, or arranged alphabetically by author. Serial set items may be listed as departmental editions, and vice versa with the result that what may

appear to be a publication lacking from your collection is a duplicate. On cuttered separates, or publications with a complicated numbering system, only the book number may be given, and not the title or date. The regional may, of course, prescribe precisely the order and detail in which the publications are to be listed. If this requirement varies significantly from the manner in which the depository maintains its records, it may cause an added burden.

The SuDocs number on a disposal list may be other than that originally assiged to the piece by the Superintendent of Documents. The SuDocs author and/or series number are frequently changed due to reorganizations within the federal government. Some libraries may continue to use the old number on new issues, and disregard the new number. Other depositories may change all the numbers on the old issues to the new number.[8] As a matter of policy, either practice is bad. In view of the documents librarian's dependence on the Monthly Catalog as a searching and identification tool, I feel that it is a very poor policy to use other than the classification number assigned to the piece by the Superintendent of Documents for material in a separate documents collection.[9]

A personal visit to inspect the pieces may provide other advantages. If the regional librarian wishes to bring the materials back to his own library, this will save a considerable amount of time in packing and mailing boxes, and in most cases will be cheaper than shipping charges. The regional librarian may wish to have the material shipped, or brought back to his own library for several reasons. He may wish to add most of the pieces to his collection. If there are a large number of small, not too bulky cuttered separate publications, he may find it easier to screen his records from the pieces, rather than from a detailed list. He may wish to consolidate these discards with those from his own or other depositories in the region, and offer them on a consolidated list throughout the region and/or out-of-state.

Geographical Area for Offering Discards.

Questions 23, 24, and 25 of the questionnaire concerned the geographical area in which the offering lists were circulated: local area of the holding depository, region-wide, and out-of-state respectively. Unfortunately, the first two questions did not ask, or obtain the critical information whether the holding library, or the regional made the offering. The answers to the first two questions threw some light on how regional libraries interpret the term "their area" in the law.

In response to question 23, "do you request the library to first attempt to find a taker for the publications in the local area?", 12 regionals replied "yes", 16 replied "no", and the other six did not answer. It would appear that the 16 regionals which answered "no" may themselves make the offer on behalf of the holding library; and if they do, it would probably be combined with a region-wide offering. Certainly an offering must be made to other depositories and libraries in the immediate area of the holding library, since this is required by law. The term "their area" in its narrowest interpretation must mean the area in

the immediate vicinity of the holding library; whereas, in its broadest sense it would mean the area of the regional depository.

In response to question 24, "are lists circulated to all other depository libraries in the region?", only one regional replied "no". However, three of the "yes" answers were qualified by the following remarks: "some", "most", and "just the largest". It would appear from this concensus, that regional librarians interpret the term "their area" in the law to mean the area of the regional library. It is gratifying to see that the regionals interpret broadly the intent of the law.

In response to question 25, "are lists of duplicates circulated out-of-state?", 16 regionals replied "yes" and 13 replied "no". The others did not answer. Eleven regional libraries replied that they circulated these lists, but two of those libraries indicated that such lists were limited to duplicates from their own collections. Four regionals replied that such lists were circulated by the holding libraries. The survey did not specifically seek to, nor did it obtain information to determine if in the latter case the regional library required the depository to circulate the lists out-of-state, or made its approval for disposal conditional upon the selective depository doing that.

Going outside of the region in an attempt to place the unwanted documents is definitely going beyond the requirements of the law. However, it is an encouraging development. It seems a shame to destroy older, out of print documents if there might be another library located anywhere else in the country which needs them. My experience has been that for those long runs of older documents which are especially needed in a research library, a regional library has more success in finding a taker from the larger number of research libraries located out-of-state than from the limited number located within its own region. The trick is, of course, to find out who they are in order to develop a worthwhile mailing list.

I believe that regional libraries should form a cooperative network among themselves to distribute discard lists submitted within their own region. To make such a network operate most effectively, the regional would have to know the general and/or specific types of materials needed by the selective depositories within its region. Thus, in question 26 the regionals were asked "do you maintain a want list of publications for your own and/or the selective depositories within your region?". Fourteen regionals answered "no". Of the 14 regionals which answered "yes", most of them specifically stated that such want lists were limited to their own needs for missing publications and gaps in their collections.

In response to question 27, "do you accept publications for which there have been no takers, in or out-of-state?", five regionals replied they did. The purpose of this question was to determine if any of the regionals would consider establishment of a storage center for documents which attracted no takers on (presumably) the first offering. To do so would go beyond the requirements of the law. The regional may authorize the destruction of publications if a reasonable effort has been made to find a legitimate taker. They might consolidate these unwanted discards for later offerings to a wider range of out-of-state libraries.

As the regional library develops its mailing lists in cooperation with other regionals or research libraries, it may eventually find candidates who want the materials which are not taken on the initial offering. It is not suggested that all unwanted materials should be retained. It is hoped that a regional librarian with a good working knowledge of his holdings would be able to make a fair determination of what type of documents might be useful later to other depositories.

It has been my experience that the types of materials for which most selective depositories request disposal authority are old and/or discontinued items. In fact, some depository librarians had the mistaken notion that they could not dispose of older materials pertaining to any current items to which they presently subscribed. The fact of the matter is they can request disposal of any piece which they have held at least five years, whether it is a current or a discontinued selection or item. In response to question 28, twenty regionals reported that most of their requests were for older and/or discontinued items. Six regionals reported their requests included both types, and only one regional reported that most of the requests it received for disposal concerned active items.

Disposal Statistics.

The response to question 29 revealed that very few regionals keep statistics of their disposal activities. The survey did not turn up any specific statistics or trends which might be reported. Usable statistics on disposal activities are also not readily available at the Office of the Superintendent of Documents. In his Special Instruction to Regional Depositories of 1962, the Superintendent of Documents requested that regionals furnish his office copies of the disposal list which they approved. No count is made of these lists, or the items on them, when they are received. They are filed with the records pertaining to the discarding library, rather than in the record file of the regional library. Thus, it is not feasible to determine the degree of compliance with the request made by the Superintendent of Documents to furnish his office copies of the approved disposal lists.

Other Disposal Policy and Problems.

In question 31, the regionals were asked to describe other policy and/or problems regarding their disposal operations. Two regionals reported that some selective depositories request disposal authority without providing on the list the information required by the regional in its instructions. Another two regionals reported some depositories submitted lists which included documents less than five years old.

Two more regional libraries reported that non-depository publications were included on some lists. A depository requires disposal authority only for depository publications, and only for the depository copy. If the library obtains additional copies of a depository publication by purchase, gift, etc., it may discard these in any manner it wishes without approval of the regional. The problem in this case may be to identify the depository copy. This is a matter of internal procedures, and depends on the type of library identification stamps which are used.

Another regional complained that some depositories send unwanted publicatations to the regional library without having been given the instructions to do so. Unfortunately, Sylvia Mechanic's otherwise useful book, Annotated List of Selected United States Government Publications Available to Depository Libraries provides the erroneous information that depository libraries may "dispose of their unwanted or unneeded documents after a five year retention period by returning these to the regional library." 10

Disposal Policy - Conclusions.

In summary, the regional library has many options in its disposal policy by which it might satisfy the requirements of the law. In 1962 the Superintendent of Documents offered "suggestions" on how the regionals could implement the law in his Special Instruction to Regional Depositories. His Instructions to Depository Libraries gave the regionals a carte blanche to issue their own implementing instructions. This policy was further confirmed in a letter of November 26, 1969 in which the Superintendent of Documents stated he believed in "adhering to the policy of permitting the Regionals to exercise the widest possible latitude in their operations." Thus, the regionals may prescribe whether they wish a general list, or a detailed list, and the extent of detail desired. In fact, they may authorize disposal without a list.

The general practice is for the regional library to require a depository to submit some type of list before it will authorize disposal of publications held at least five years. The regional considers this list as the initial offering of those publications, and usually screens the list for those publications which it wishes to add to its collection. At this point, the action which the regional takes will depend on whether it has adopted an active or a passive policy. This will determine the amount and type of assistance which it will provide. The law merely states that the regional "will provide assistance for depository libraries in the disposal of unwanted Government publications." Neither the law nor the implementing instructions of the Superintendent of Documents describes the extent of that assistance.

The regional which has adopted a passive policy may delegate all further action to the holding library. It may direct the library to make all offerings of the materials, prescribing the area in which they are to be offered. As a minimum it might direct the depository to offer the material only to other depositories and/or libraries in its own immediate area, and if it fails to find a taker to destroy the publications. Or it may direct the depository to offer the materials to all, or a select group of other depositories throughout the region. It may direct, or leave it up to the initiative of the depository to offer the materials to other libraries out-of-state.

On the other hand the regional library may adopt a more active policy in assisting the selective depository to dispose of unwanted publications. The regional librarian may visit the depository to inspect the materials. The regional library may ask the depository to ship all the materials to the regional library where they could be consolidated with discards from

other depositories. At regular intervals, the regional might make an offering of these materials to all other depositories in the region, and very likely to out-of-state libraries as well. Or, the regional may act as a clearinghouse or middle-man. It may prepare the offering lists and distribute them to all (or selected)depositories within the region, and possibly to selected out-of-state libraries. It might then receive the replies, determine which libraries are to receive specific materials, and then direct the holding libraries to ship them to the designated libraries. The receiving library should recognize from the mailing label the library which sent the material, and would send the reimbursement of shipping charges to that library, rather than to the regional.

The "clearinghouse" method appears to be working very successfully for the University of Iowa Library, the Iowa regional. The Iowa system also incorporates several other fine features. It does not use the traditional "first-come-first-served" system. The consolidated offering list(s) are mailed to other depositories in Iowa and out-of-state libraries at the same time. All interested libraries are given 40 days in which to submit their requests. At the end of the 40 day period, the regional library considers all requests received without regard to date of receipt. It does give priority to Iowa depositories which satisfies the letter and intent of the law.

The Iowa system appears to be good both for the discarding and receiving libraries. The University of Iowa reports that they are able to find takers for a larger percentage of the materials. On the other hand the receiving libraries are more likely to submit requests when they know all replies will be considered. They will also make a more accurate and thorough screening of their records in order to request only those materials which they need, rather than making a quick and dirty check to obtain a fast return and mailing in the hope of beating out the other libraries.

Since the regional library normally deals with more libraries, sometimes on a regular basis, it may have developed a mailing list of libraries which have shown an interest in obtaining certain types of publications. It is, therefore, in a better position to get a favorable response than a selective depository which may be making the offer on a one time effort.

V. INTERLIBRARY LOAN.

The Depository Library Act of 1962 required that regional libraries provide interlibrary loan to other depositories in the region. (44 U.S.C. 1912) The law does not require the regional library to provide such service to all libraries in the region. However, as a practical matter the regional library may provide interlibrary loan to any library which might normally call upon its parent library for such service.

Congressional Hearings On Interlibrary Loan.

During the hearings on the revision of the depository library laws, it was generally felt that the requirement for the regional library to provide interlibrary loan service, combined with the provision a depository could discard any piece after holding it five years, would affect the number of items which a depository would select. [1] It was believed that the generous provisions for discarding would tend to increase the number of items a depository might select. Since it knew that it would not have to retain everything permanently, a depository would probably select a larger and wider variety of items.

On the other hand it was believed that with the interlibrary loan provision, a depository would decrease the amount of selections, since it could call upon the regional for any piece. One witness also testified that this provision might influence a library which might otherwise wish to become a depository to forego the added responsbilities.[2] However, these latter arguments overlooked several points. By law a regional is required to provide interlibrary loan service to other depository libraries only. Secondly, a regional could place reasonable limits on the type of materials which it might release for interlibrary loan. For example, one could not reasonably expect a regional to loan its depository copy of a heavily used reference book, such as the latest edition of the Statistical Abstract.

It appears to me that the intent of the law was that the regional would be required to loan materials which are beyond the normal retention date of five years; and for current materials it would be expected to loan, especially to smaller depositories, materials which were not heavily used, or items which a smaller depository might not be expected to select. For example, a small depository might not be reasonably expected to select all Congressional hearings, but could certainly be expected to select the Statistical Abstract.

Processing of Interlibrary Loan Requests.

Part IV of the survey dealt with the policy of regional libraries on interlibrary loan. In response to question 31, "are interlibrary loan requests for U.S. government documents processed by the Interlibrary Loan Office, the Documents Office, or a combination of both?", twenty regionals answered "the Interlibrary Loan Office", only two answered "Documents Office", and the other twelve answered a combination of both. It appeared that the latter was the more common practice, irrespective

of whether the government documents collection is separate, integrated, or partially integrated.

Based on the answers of those libraries which more fully described their procedures, it appears that the common practice is to require requests to be submitted on standard ALA forms to the Interlibrary Loan Office, which initially processes the requests. The Documents Office is usually asked to identify, search, and retrieve the piece and to authorize its release. The Interlibrary Loan Office then normally prepares the material for mailing or reproduction, mails the material, and completes the administrative aspects of the transaction to include sending tracers, and billing for lost materials, if necessary. In the latter case, it would normally ask the Documents Office for the price of the piece.

Thus, the documents interlibrary loan program is integrated with that of the parent library. It generally follows the policy prescribed by the parent library. Interlibrary loan service is provided not only to other depository libraries, but all other libraries which might call upon the resources of the parent library. However, I am sure that most regional libraries on occasion deviate from this normal policy and take special requests submitted in any convenient manner by their selective depositories and provide expedited service.

Interlibrary Loan Statistics.

Question 32 of the survey asked for statistics regarding interlibrary loan activity. Only four regionals indicated that the Documents Office maintained any type of statistics on this activity. The present situation appears to be that although Interlibrary Loan Offices of the reporting libraries keep statistics, they do not maintain a separate breakout for U.S. government documents. Thus, it would be difficult to measure the effect of the interlibrary loan provision of the depository library law on selection policies of the other depository libraries. Has it decreased the number of items they select as predicted? Has it increased the number of items selected? Or has it had no significant difference? I am inclined to believe it has made no difference.

Restrictions on Interlibrary Loans.

In survey question 33, regional libraries were asked to describe what restrictions, if any had they placed on interlibrary loans. The specific restrictions which were mentioned are listed below. Although other libraries did not specifically mention them, I think it is reasonable to assume that most of these restrictions exist in most regional libraries' loan policies. The regional libraries state that they placed restrictions on the following types of publications or requests (number of times cited in parenthesis): reference books (4 times); publications needed locally, or in heavy demand (4); out-of-state requests (3); census material (3); documents in poor condition (2); fragile materials (2); U.S. Statutes (2); and the following once each: laws and regulations, U.S. Code, recent Congressional Record, serial set, statistical materials, documents over 100 years old, docu-

ments printed before 1900, current topic materials, valuable materials, rare items, and reserve books. Several libraries specifically mentioned loan period restrictions which ranged from 1-5 weeks. Several libraries also mentioned that, depending on the situation, they might provide Xerox or microfilm copy at cost.

The general conclusion to be drawn from these replies is that regional libraries do not interpret the interlibrary loan provision of the law as requiring them to loan all of the depository documents in their collection, and that first priority for use of their materials belongs to their library's own local clientelle.

Local Circulation of Depository Publications.

Since the question of circulation is related to interlibrary loan, the regional libraries were asked in question 34 if they allowed depository materials to circulate locally, and if so, what restrictions were placed on such loans. Only 4 of the regionals replied that they did not allow materials to circulate. Restrictions were placed on certain types of materials, particularly on reference books, and titles for which there was a heavy demand. The following loan periods were reported with the number of times mentioned shown in parenthesis: one week (5 times), two weeks (6), three weeks (5), four weeks (3), and five weeks (once). One academic depository reported it allowed faculty members to check out publications for the semester, subject to recall and the restrictions on types of documents mentioned above.

As for restrictions on clientelle, the state libraries reported that loans were restricted to the following, with the number of times listed shown in parenthesis: state employees (6 times), local libraries (2), state agencies (2), anyone with a public library card (1), and licensed professionals (1). One public library reported the following were authorized to make loans: companies and adult patrons. Academic libraries reported that loans were made to the following with the number of times mentioned shown in parenthesis: faculty (4 times), graduate students only (2), all students (2), staff (1), and responsible members of the local community (2 times).

The law does not require the regional library, or any depository library to circulate depository materials locally. In his Instructions to Depository Libraries, the Superintendent of Documents states the following policy: "Government publications supplied to depository libraries should receive the same care and treatment as privately published material. ... If they can circulate as do other books in your collection, so much the better." 3 In the matter of circulation as well as interlibrary loan, the regional should always be aware of its role as the permanent depository for its region to preserve the collection, but it should weigh this against its duty to make its collection available and useful to the general public.

Augmentation of the Collection.

In response to question 35, " have you augmented your resources to provide interlibrary loan?", 16 regionals replied "yes", and 12 replied

"no". Fourteen regional libraries specifically mentioned duplicates as a means of augmentation, while only four mentioned microforms. In many cases a depository may receive duplicate copies of depository titles by virtue of being on an agency mailing list. Many duplicates can also be obtained free upon specific request to the issuing agency. In spite of the more frequent mention of duplicates over microforms, there was not enough evidence available to conclude that regionals prefer their back-up copies to be in hard copy, rather than in microform.

In response to question 36, "what types of materials do you lack in your collection to satisfy unfilled interlibrary loan requests?", the most frequently mentioned (11 times) were older materials, particularly those published before the library became a depository. The next item most frequently mentioned was non-depository material in general (9 times). In addition, the following specific types of non-depository materials were mentioned: technical reports (twice), National Archives microfilms (twice), and the following once each: committee prints, and publications of independent agencies. Another library mentioned that it lacks duplicate copies of high demand materials. The Depository Library Act of 1962 with its provisions for discarding has helped many regionals to fill in missing gaps in their collections of older depository materials, and to obtain duplicates. However, this program might be more effective if there were greater cooperation among the regional libraries in exchanging disposal lists with other regionals.

VI. REFERENCE ASSISTANCE.

The Depository Library Act of 1962 requires that the regional libraries provide "reference assistance" to the other depositories within their region. One usually thinks of reference asistance as that provided person to person within the library building, rather than library to library. The Superintendent of Documents has not issued implementing instructions to define this requirement. The regionals are again allowed "the widest possible latitude in their operations" and their interpretation of this requirement. It would appear to me that the key word is "assistance" rather than "reference", and that the intent of the law is for the regionals to provide to other depositories the maximum amount of assistance within their resources in providing depository service, and to respond to reasonable requests for information and assistance when asked. This part of the survey was intended to find out what types of assistance the regionals were providing.

1971 SUDOCS Biennial Investigation Report.

In his 1971 Biennial Investigation Report (a mail questionnaire), the Superintendent of Documents asked six questions pertaining to the regional depository program. The first three questions were answered by non-regional depositories only, and the last three by regional depositories only. The response was as follows:[1]

47. "Has a Regional Depository been designated under the Depository Library Act, to serve your State or area?" Yes 777. No 124. Don't know 71. No answer 38.

48. "If answer to above question is YES, have you had occasion to use the services of your Regional Depository in the past year?" Yes 474. No 299. No answer 4.

49. "Has the service of your Regional Depository been satisfactory?" Yes 557. No 13. No answer 207.

50. "As a designated Regional Depository, does a representative from your library make periodic visits to the depositories which you serve?" Yes 10. No 30. No answer 1.

51 "As a Regional Depository have you prepared specific instructions regarding disposal of publications for the libraries which you serve?" Yes 33. No 8.

52. "Are all depository libraries in your region aware of your status as the designated Regional Depository?" Yes 38. No 2. No answer 1.

The two questions regarding user satisfaction did not specifically ask what type of service had been provided by the regionals. However, the answers did indicate that the service provided had been satisfactory. The question on periodic visits by a regional representative, however, entered into the undefined area of "reference assistance". Such visits

are not required by the law, and a member of the staff of the Public Documents Department agreed with me on this point.[2] Why did the Superintendent of Documents then include this question on the Biennial Investigation Report? Possibly to encourage such visits, for this staff member stated it was felt that the regional could provide better service if it were better acquainted with its depositories: i.e. knew something about their organization, facilities, collections, and methods of operation.

Periodic Visits by Regionals.

Since the issue of periodic visits had been raised, the regional libraries were asked in question 38 of this survey, "how many depositories in your region have you visited since your library became a regional?", and in question 39, "how many depositories have you visited during the past two years...?" The answers are tabulated below:

Number of depositories visited	Number of regionals reporting: Since becoming regional	During last two years
None	4	7
1 to 4	7	7
5 to 10	8	9
11 to 20	3	1
over 20	2	0

As for the relative distances involved in visits during the past two years, a total of 85 depositories were visited by 17 regionals, broken down by distance as follows: 0-25 mile radius - 18 depositories; 26-50 mile radius - 26 depositories; 51-100 mile radius - 22 depositories; 101-150 mile radius - 10 depositories; and over 150 miles - nine depositories.

In response to question 39, "what was the purpose of these visits and what assistance was provided?", the following items were mentioned: to meet the documents librarian and staff; to see how document service was organized, number of personnel (full and/or part time duty), and location of documents service within the library organization; to see types of records maintained and methods used for processing and servicing the collection; to see the collection, its extent, and how organized (separate and/or integrated); to see library facilities; to provide professional advice, and answer questions on problems; to advise on weeding, organization, and record keeping; to pick up discards and help with duplicates; to prepare for workshops and meetings; and to publicize the services which might be provided by the regional.

With respect to visits I feel strongly that such visits by a regional representative should be for the purpose of assistance, and not for inspection. The law itself specifically says "assistance". It also specifically assigns the inspection powers and responsibilities to the Superintendent of Documents. However, there is one provision of the law which might be interpreted as assigning inspection power to a regional (provided it is the "library authority of the state"). The justification for designation of a new depository must be certified by either every existing depository library in the district, or by the state library

authority (usually the state library).[3] It would appear to me that the authority to certify new designations also includes an authority to inspect existing depositories in the district to determine the adequacy of service. I feel that this provision of the law should be amended to limit certification of new depositories to the state library authority only, which should be further authorized to recommend withdrawal of designations as well. There are too many depositories which do not deserve to retain the designation.

The Depository Library Act of 1962 renewed the authority of the Superintendent of Documents to "make first hand investigation on conditions (in depository libraries) for which need is indicated." (44 U.S.C.1909). However, the inspection program of the Superintendent of Documents has been conducted mainly by a mail questionnaire, the Biennial Investigation Report which is conducted primarily to satisfy the requirement of the law which states that "designated depository libraries shall report to the Superintendent of Documents every two years concerning their condition." The Superintendent of Documents has recently stated publicly on several occasions that he plans to schedule more on site inspection and liaison visits to depository libraries.[4] Most of these would probably be conducted by personnel assigned to the various new regional offices of the Government Printing Office.

Phone and Letter Requests.

Questions 40 and 41 concerned the number and types of reference assistance provided on phone and letter requests. Again, so few regionals kept statistics that no meaningful data was collected. The questions also did not gain the desired response since they did not state specifically they referred only to that type of reference assistance provided to other depositories in accordance with the law. Most of the answers indicated specific types of service provided for any telephone or mail inquiry, to include service to individuals, to other libraries or librarians, and to depository libraries.

The answers did indicate that regional libraries are service oriented and respond to any reasonable request, limited only by the amount of time and resources available to them. These services include making bibliographic searches and providing publication identification such as SuDocs number, price, author, and title. Quick reference types of service are also provided: giving answers to specific questions, or providing information on sources and where they might be found. With respect to assistance to depository libraries, several regionals also reported providing assistance on the operation of the depository program, to include clarification of disposal instructions, advice on selection of items, and advice on record keeping.

Assistance on Item Selection.

In response to question 42, "do you assist new depositories in selecting items?", 13 regionals answered "yes, and 21 answered "no". Several regionals added the remark that they assisted upon request. The other regionals would probably also provide such assistance, if asked.

However, I feel that regionals should take a more active role in this area, not only for new depositories, but for older depositories as well. This is one area in which the regionals can do a considerable amount of good. One regional library which saw this need has made a major contribution to depository library service. The New York State Library sponsored the preparation of Sylvia Mechanic's book, Annotated List of Selected United States Government Publications Available to Depository Libraries.5 This book is valuable not only for its annotations, but also for its selection of items which are recommended for depositories of various sizes.

One of the things which documents librarians appear to consistently complain about is the lack of, or inadequate annotations of depository items. The Depository Library Act of 1962 requires the Superintendent of Documents to "issue a classified list of Government publications in suitable form, containing annotations of contents." (44 U.S.C. 1904) An analysis was made of 438 new items which the Superintendent of Documents has added in the last several years. There were annotations on only 67, or 15% of the item cards, which are the classified list required by law. In addition to the item cards, the Superintendent of Documents attempts to provide a sample copy of the new item with the Monthly Survey List. During 1971, 163 new items were introduced. Sample copies accompanied the item cards and Monthly Survey List in only 100 cases, or 61% of the total.

However, the major problem is not with the new items, but the items currently on the list. A regional can help both a new, or an older depository with its selection of these items. The best way for a depository to determine if it wishes to select an item is to actually inspect a collection which includes that item, and thus see the number and types of publications involved. For example, the item may include some of the types of publications which the library needs, but the numbers involved may be so great it would be more feasible for the library to obtain these publications individually elsewhere. For example, item 323 (Army Regulations) contains two useful reference sources: Official Tables of Distances (AR 55-60) and Standards of Medical Fitness (AR 40-501) which lists the physical requirements for selective service. I would not advise any selective depository to choose this item which generates hundreds of publications each year just to get these two documents.

Another catch-all, or grab-bag category are the general publications, the ".2" classification items. They are, as Sylvia Mechanic describes them, "the surprise items. One is really not quite sure what to expect and is continually amazed by the unique, informative publications which are included under this heading." 6 However, I do not share her enthusiasm, or her opinion that depository "librarians will not question their inclusion." 7 Not only do I question their inclusion, but so do many of the documents librarians in my region. They are reluctant to select these items since they not only do not know what they will get, but also how much they will get. Since they are separate publications, the amount of record keeping required is greater. One must normally prepare a separate catalog card for each piece. My advice is to be sure (or reasonably sure), rather than sorry. I would recommend that if a depository is interested in such items, it inspect the collection

of its regional library, or the nearest large academic or public library which is a depository.

A regional library might suggest certain desireable items which their depositories should select. My experience has been that many depositories are not selecting some very useful periodicals. Price List, PL 36, Government Periodicals and Subscription Services is a good selection tool, since it gathers these together in one place. On the other hand, I think that the selective depositories can be faulted for not seeking advice more often. While they can discontinue an item by having chosen it and gotten a few samples, I think they would save themselves time, money, and effort in the long run if they would visit the nearest large depository collection to inspect it, and determine the types and numbers of pieces involved in specific items in which they are interested. I am sure that depositories other than regionals would welcome such visits.

Survey of Selective Depositories.

In response to question 43, "have you made a survey of the selective depositories in your region?", only five regionals replied "yes". There is, of course, no legal requirement for a regional library to make such surveys. It is just another way in which a regional might learn more about the depositories which it serves, and thereby hope to provide better service. Two of the surveys reported were made in connection with a government documents workshop.[8]

Such a survey might include questions on: (1) organization (number and types of personnel assigned; whether or not a separate unit; where personnel and/or unit are located in library hierarchy); (2) item selection (number and types); (3) organization of the collection (separate and/or integrated; number of documents bound; storage/shelving aids; and number of pieces); (4) record keeping practices (samples of record cards, arrangement in shelf list order or alphabetically); (5) patron use of collection; and (6) other matters.

Workshops, Seminars, and Conferences.

In response to question 44, "have you conducted or sponsored any workshops, seminars, conferences, or similar events for depositories in your region?", nine regionals reported that they had sponsored or conducted a total of 19 such events. Twenty five regionals reported that they had not. Several of these latter regionals reported that they planned to do so in the future. These meetings are yet another facet of reference assistance, not required by law, but designed to improve the service provided by, and to all depositories in the region. Three of these meetings were conducted as part of other larger meetings or conferences: two in connection with a state library association conference, and one in conjunction with a state library conference on interlibrary loan.

The proceedings of five of these meetings have been published: those of California[9] (includes proceedings of three separate meetings in one publication), New York[10] and Illinois.[11] The Illinois meeting whose proceedings were published in a regular issue of the Illinois Libraries provides a model of this genre and is a good starting point for any regional which wishes to take this route.

Before the Illinois workshop, a survey and questionnaire was sent to the other depositories. The replies provided information about the depositories themselves, plus ideas about problem areas and subjects which could be scheduled for discussion. The workshop itself was conducted in three parts. In the morning, formal presentations were made by several guest speakers, and several Illinois documents librarians on subjects which it was hoped would interest and inform the group. In the afternoon, the assembly was broken down into three discussion groups. A transcript was taken on the main problem areas discussed. Each group had a moderator, resource person, and recorder. The topics for discussion were interlibrary cooperation; bibliographical control; and selection, use and servicing of documents. At the close of the workshop in the evening, a summary was presented of the major problems discussed, together with recommendations for further action.[12]

Newsletters and Announcements.

In response to question 46, "do you issue a newsletter or similar annoucement to inform depositories about the program, or about specific publications, series, or item?", only four regionals replied "yes". Such a device could be used to exchange information among the depositories within the region. It might even include discard and duplicate lists. From my response, the model of this genre was "The Shipping List" published by the University of Virginia Alderman Library. Other regional libraries who are interested in following this route would do well to examine an issue for ideas.

Other Reference Assistance.

In response to question 47, "what other assistance do you provide to depositories?", the following things were specifically mentioned: union list of items selected by depositories within the region (three times); advice on organization and management of depository collection; advice on regulations regarding disposal; inviting visits from depositories to discuss their problems; first choice on duplicates. One regional reported a commendable effort which it coordinates regarding the problem of non-depository publications. It collects and consolidates lists of non-depository publications for which a SuDocs number has not appeared in the Monthly Catalog, and sends them to the Superintendent of Documents with the request that a number be assigned. One regional answered "any required", and another regional answered unfortunately "not enough", which taken together illustrates a devotion to service exercised by regional libraries within their limited resources of personnel, time, and money.

VII. FEDERAL SUPPORT.

The last part of the survey attempted to get the opinions of regional depository librarians on the need for and/or desireability of providing federal support to accomplish the added responsibilities of a regional library. The subject was brought up and discussed repeatedly during the House committee hearings in 1957 and 1958 on depository library law revisions.[1] However, by mid 1962 during the Senate hearings there was little or no mention about federal support for the regionals. What caused the difference?

Congressional Hearings on Federal Support.

In the earlier House hearings many of the witnesses for the library profession testified that a depository library would probably not accept the added regional responsibilities without being provided federal support. The subcommittee members appeared to be receptive to providing such support also.[2] As originally introduced, the depository library law amendment would have required the regional to accept and retain for a minimum of 20 years, two copies of each depository publication. (H.R. 9186, 85th Congress). All other depositories would have been required to retain them for only 10 years. The library profession witnesses testified that a regional (or research) library would wish to retain most government publications permanently,[3] and that the requirement to retain two copies of all publications would require the regionals to provide double the amount of storage space then used. This represented a considerable additional expense and investment.

When the revised bill was reintroduced in 1962, it had been amended to provide that a regional would be required to retain only one copy (or a microfacsimile) permanently (H.R. 8141, 87th Congress). Not only was the requirement to retain two copies dropped from the bill, but a provision was added for the Superintendent of Documents to provide the regionals "microfacsimile copies of certain depository publications within the limits of available appropriations." The intent of this provision was that the federal government would provide microforms of older and/or less used documents (particularly voluminous material) which the regional could substitute for its hard copy to conserve space. This was apparently inserted to offset the added cost to the regionals in performing their additional responsibilities.

However, the Public Printer strongly object now about his added costs,[4] and influenced the deletion of this provision from the act. The library respresentatives apparently did not object too strongly to this deletion because they had achieved their major goal from the legislation: increased the number of congressional designations from 1 to 2 for each senator and representative. They had also pushed through the provision that non-GPO publications would be provided through the depository library system. The Public Printer was probably more violently opposed to the non-GPO publications provision.[5] So the librarians came out even in their battles with the Public Printer: won one, and lost one.

Additional Resources Expended by Regionals.

In response to question 48, "what additional resources have you added, or expended due to your designation as a regional?", 11 regionals replied "none", and 18 regionals listed some type of augmentation (of these, 11 mentioned additional space, and 12 mentioned additional personnel.) However, it is difficult to determine if these additional resources were due mainly to their designation as a regional, or were due to normal growth. During the past decade, the number of active items has increased appreciably, though the non-GPO items authorized by the 1962 law represent little of this increase. Not only has the number of items increased, but the number of pieces, and the size of those pieces for many items has greatly increased. More items have been added than have been withdrawn.

How have the documents collections of the regionals increased as a result of their new status? They must now accept all items offered. However, most of the regionals were previously "all" depositories, or had selected nearly all of the items offered. They are now required by law to retain all depository publications permanently, either in hard copy or microform. However, as research libraries it is probable that most of them would have retained much of these materials anyway. Indeed, the bill as originally introduced would have permitted a 20 year retention period, which was changed to a permanent retention period primarily due to the testimony of the library profession witnesses. I do not feel that the collections have increased appreciably solely due to the assumption of regional responsibilities.

How about interlibrary loan responsibilities? The evidence from this survey is inconclusive. It appears that most of the regionals provide interlibrary loan service to all libraries which might otherwise be in the area served by the parent library. It is difficult to isolate the number of requests which have come specifically from the other depositories in the region. It was also impossible to determine from the survey whether the amount of interlibrary loan service provide to other depositories as required by law has been influenced by the liberal five year retention and discard provisions of the law.

Most of the added responsibilities and need to expend additional resources occur in the area of providing assistance in disposal, and for reference assistance. The regional must receive requests from, and authorize a selective depository to discard any publication which it has held a minimum of five years. However, the added amount of resources which it must expend to perform this function is within its control. Both the law and Instructions to Depository Libraries permit the regionals to exercise the "widest possible latitude in their operations." The regional may prescribe what type of discard list it wants: general, detailed, partially detailed, or none at all. Requirements for a detailed list may indeed discourage some depositories from seeking permission to discard older materials.

The regional may also determine the amount of assistance it will provide to help the depositories to dispose of the unwanted materials.

It may require the holding library to make all offerings and process the requests for the materials. On the other hand, the regional may act as a clearinghouse and combine the lists from its depositories, mail the offering lists, process the replies, and then issue instructions to the holding library on where to send the materials. The regional may even relieve the depository of all work in the disposal operations, except submitting a general list. It may ask the depositories to ship all discards to the regional library, which would then complete the disposal process to include preparing and mailing consolidated offering lists, processing the replies, and shipping the materials.

As for added resources needed to fulfill the requirements for providing "reference assistance", this may also be controlled by the regional library depending on whether it wishes to play an active or a passive role. If it plays a passive role, the amount of resources devoted to this service may be negligible. It it plays an active role, the amount may be considerable. Some of the things which the more active regionals have done to provide such assistance were discussed in section VI: making periodic visits, conducting workshops and conferences, publishing newsletters and announcements, etc.

Types of Federal Support Recommended.

In response to question 49, "do you feel that the federal government should furnish additional support to the regional?", 28 regional librarians answered "yes", 2 answered "no", and four did not reply. Of the two documents librarians who answered "no", one felt that federal support should be supplied only if the regional library is a private institution. So far, all regional libraries are publicly supported institutions. The other regional librarian felt that a library had accepted the added responsibility knowing that federal support was not provided by the law, and therefore it did not have to volunteer to accept the designation.

The regional librarians were also asked to indicate what type of additional federal support should be provided. Their replies may have been influenced by the fact several types of support were suggested in the question. The following types of support which had been suggested were specifically mentioned: travel money (9 times), duplicates (9 times), and microforms (15 times). Funds for additional personnel were mentioned five times. The following items were mentioned at least once each: storage costs, commercial indexes and references for government publications, non-depository publications, microform equipment (mentioned together with microforms), free postage, funds for workshops, and funds for binding. These items are discussed below.

--- Duplicates and Microforms.

Regional librarians would like to have duplicates provided for heavily used materials only. They do not want two copies of all depository publications which would have been provided by the bill originally introduced in 1957. They would also like microforms for several reasons: as back-up for their original hard copy, and in other cases to substitute for the original hard copy to conserve storage space.

A number of depository publications are available in microform. These were discussed on pages 13-15 above. Federal funds might be provided for regionals to purchase these materials.

During 1962 the Public Printer was opposed to furnishing microforms which would have been concerned with older materials. These were intended to save space (and costs) for the regionals. Now the Public Printer has proposed his own microform publishing program, which will be limited to newly published materials. This program is being promoted as a cost saver for the federal government. It would provide depository copies in microform in lieu of the more expensive printed copies. The program may, however, provide to the regionals only, both microform and printed copies of each publication. One regional librarian suggested that the federal government furnish the necessary reading equipment along with microforms. This is not included in the proposed program.

--- Additional Staff.

Five regional librarians suggested that federal funds be provided for additional staff. Awarding of such grants might be difficult to administer. Any federal support which is provided should be solely for those additional expenses incurred as a result of the added regional responsibilities. These may be difficult to isolate. The amount of additional expenses would vary depending on whether the regional plays an active or a passive role. The number of depositories served would have some influence. The type of library organization for documents service may also be a factor. A separate documents department usually has responsibilities for other government documents which may include state documents, foreign government documents, U.N. documents, and technical reports. In an integrated or partially integrated collection, responsibilities for certain functions are fragmented and it would be difficult to determine how much these other departments contribute to the documents operation.

In any case, I feel that the programs should be given more support by the libraries which have accepted these important responsibilities. A previous survey limited to academic libraries which are regionals shows the very limited staff which are operating these programs: 19 academic regionals reported that the average number of full time equivalent personnel assigned to government documents work was: librarians - 1.6; librarian assistants (non-professionals) - 2.1; and student assistants - 1.6. It is generally acknowledged that government documents are most heavily used in academic libraries.[6] At most of the reporting libraries, these personnel were also responsible for other types of government documents in addition to U.S. depository publications. Service hours are usually much longer at academic libraries, although a separate documents department may not maintain the same hours as the rest of the library.

--- Free Postage for ILL and Disposal Operations.

One regional librarian suggested that free postage should be provided. This remark could have referred to postage costs incurred

in interlibrary loan and also disposal operations. As such, it could be expanded to include administrative costs for these operations. For example, in disposal operations (gift and exchange) the donor library has traditionally requested reimbursement only for shipping charges (usually postage). However, a considerable amount of other expenses is involved: offering lists must be prepared, mailed, and processed; suitable shipping materials (boxes, tape, labels, etc.) must be obtained; and the packages must be packed and prepared for shipment.

Thus a regional or library which makes an effort to find a willing home for the maximum number of pieces, while destroying the minimum number, incurrs a greater cost than the library which exercises less initiative and takes the easy route. Provision of federal support to this activity may encourage more regionals to take a more active role, and to establish greater cooperation among themselves in exchanging duplicate lists.

--- Reference Books and Indexes.

One regional librarian suggested that federal funds (or the actual books) should be provided for commercially produced reference books and indexes pertaining to U.S. government documents. I would imagine that such reference books as Sylvia Mechanic's Annotated List of Selected United States Government Publications Available to Depository Libraries, and the Congressional Information Service (CIS) Index would fall into these categories. As a minimum, the next decennial index to the Monthly Catalog should be provided free to the regionals if it will be a sales item as was the last 1951-1960 index.

--- Non-Depository Publications.

Another regional librarian suggested that funds should be made available to obtain non-depository publications, since the regionals often receive requests for these materials. This appears to be beyond the intended scope of the current depository library program. However, perhaps this should not be so, and the non-GPO publications provision of the Depository Library Act of 1962 should be broadly interpreted to include this. A case might be made for making the regional depositories full service libraries for all available federal government publications. If this were the case, the federal government might pay the annual subscription fees for the Documents Expediting Project (DocEx), and for the Readex Microprint non-depository service (to include all back years). The federal government might also designate the regional libraries to receive one copy (hard copy or microform) of all publications listed in the Government Reports Announcements.

--- Conducting Workshops, Conferences, etc.

Another regional librarian suggested that the federal government might furnish funds for conducting workshops, conferences, and similar meetings. Such a request would require the federal government to define more specifically the term "reference assistance" in the law. At present it appears that the state libraries, especially when they

are also the state library authority, are more interested in conducting workshops, They see their responsibilities as regional depositories for federal documents to be merely an extension of their responsibility to provide or support state wide general library service.[7] However, the state university and metropolitan public library depository usually does not have such state wide commitments to provide library service, and is more reluctant to assume such a role.

--- Binding.

Another regional librarian suggested that federal funds should be made available for binding. Most government publications are printed in paper back copy. One regional reported that since it has assumed that status it would like to have most of its depository materials bound. In his Instructions to Depository Libraries, the Superintendent of Documents states that "libraries are expected to include these publications (unbound or in paper covers) in their binding program along with books, periodicals, and other privately published materials."[8] However, in this case, an exception could be made for regional libraries. They are required by law to retain these documents permanently; the other depositories are not, and may discard them after five years retention. Federal funding in this area could be administered evenly. Every regional irrespective of its size, organization, or number of depositories which it serves receives only one depository copy of a publication. Likewise, if a publication is produced by GPO in a limited number of bound copies for a previously select audience, that number should be increased (if necessary) to provide one bound copy to each regional.

--- Travel Money.

The fact that travel money was mentioned nine times appears to indicate that more regional librarians would like to make periodic visits to the selective depositories within their region. The Superintendent of Documents appears to encourage such visits by including this subject on his Biennial Investigation Report. However, at present no federal funds are provided for this purpose. Such visits are not required by law, nor should they be unless reimbursement of travel expenses is provided. This would reuire the depository library law to more specifically define the term "reference assistance".

If federal funds were provided for travel, they should be for assistance only, and not for inspection purposes. At present, the Superintendent of Documents has the responsibility and authority for inspection of depository libraries. If this responsibility for inspection is to be delegated, I feel that it should be transferred to the state library authority, rather than to the regional library. Only 15 of the 41 regional libraries are state libraries, and presumably the state library authority for their state. In the other states, where the regionals are academic and/or metropolitan public libraries, the regional might act as an agent for the state library authority.

FOOTNOTES

PART I. THE DEPOSITORY LIBRARY ACT OF 1962.

1. U.S. Congress, Joint Committee on Printing, Government Depository Libraries; the present law governing designated depository libraries, Committee Print, 92d Congress, 2d session April 1972, pp 1-5 (hereafter referred to as "Committee Print, Government Depository Libraries, 1972")

All statistics relating to the number and type of depositories in 1972 are based on the material in this publication.

2. U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Rules and Administration, Subcommittee on the Library, Revising the Laws Relating to Depository Libraries, 87th Congress, 2d session, 1962, S.Rpt. 1587 to accompany H.R. 8141, p. 4 (hereafter referred to as "S.Rpt. 87-1587")

All statistics relating to the number of possible, actual, and vacancies of depository designations in 1962 are based on information in this publication.

3. U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Rules and Administration Subcommittee on the Library, Hearings, Depository Libraries, 87th Congress, 2d session, 1962, p. 92 (hereafter referred to "Senate Hearings, 1962")

4. S.Rpt. 87-1587, p. 7

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.

7. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Congressional District Data; districts of the 92d and 93rd Congress, 1971-1972.

8. Senate Hearings, 1962, pp. 47-48.

9. Committee Print, Government Depository Libraries, 1972, p. 1.

10. Clifton Brock, "Federal Depository System; a proposal for change", CRL 23: 197-206+ (May 1962)

11. Senate Hearings, 1962, pp. 133-146.

12. Brock, op. cit., p. 201.

13. Ibid., p. 203.

14. Ibid.

15. These are H.R. 10562, 11458, and 11921.

16. U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Aprropriations, Hearings, Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1973, 92d Congress, 2d session, 1972, p. 330.

17. These four states are Alabama, Arkansas, Missouri, and New Mexico. The state library in all, except Arkansas, is also a new depository and had to obtain a congressional designation.

18. These are H.R. 10316, 12695, 12606, 12778, and 12933.

19. Yuri Nakata, "Profile of Federal Depository Libraries in Illinois", Illinois Libraries 53: 437 (June 1971).

20. U.S. Congress, House, Committee on House Administration, Hearings, Revision of Depository Library Laws, 85th Congress, 1st (and 2d) session, 1958, p. 173 (hereafter referred to as "House Hearings, 1958")

The Powell Report, "The Depository Library System-an Examination with Recommendations for Increasing its Effectiveness" was based on returns to a questionnaire prepared jointly by the House Subcommittee to Study Federal Printing and Paper Work of the Committee on House Administration and the ALA Public Documents Committee. The chairman of the Public Documents Committee was Benjamin E. Powell, Librarian of Duke University.

21. The Powell Report suggested that a "minimum percentage of around 50 percent should be required". (Ibid., p. 179)
22. Mildred Benson and Signe Otterson, Roster of Federal Libraries (Washington: George Washington University Medical Center, October 1970), p. iii.
23. Senate Hearings, 1962, pp. 59 and 110.
24. Ibid., pp. 91-92.
25. This count is based on items listed in U.S. Public Documents Department, Government Printing Office, List of Classes of United States Government Documents Available for Selection by Depository Libraries, revised to August 21, 1971.
26. Senate Hearings, 1962, p. 68.
27. Ibid., p. 71.
28. Ibid., p. 62.

PART II. REGIONAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES.

1. House Hearings, 1958, see pp. 30, 41, 50, 79, 83, 85, 97, 98, 106-108, 183-184, 187, 202, and 208.
2. Ibid., p. 40.
3. Results of this survey are contained in unpublished report, "Survey of U.S. Government Documents Regional Depositories (Academic Libraries)", November 1971. A copy of this report was furnished to the depositories which returned a completed questionnaire.
4. U.S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Instructions to Depository Libraries, September 1967, p. 5 (hereafter referred to as "Instructions to Depository Libraries, 1967).

PART III. RENTENTION POLICY.

1. Instructions to Depository Libraries, 1967, pp. 10-12.
2. Guide to Microforms in Print (Washington: Microcard Editions, 1961- annual), 1972, pp. 140-150.
3. House Hearings, 1958, pp. 53-54.
4. Senate Hearings, 1962, pp. 60 and 109.
5. Presentation by Robert E. Kling, Jr., Superintendent of Documents, "Micro-publishing - A Service to the Library Community through the Public Documents Department", June 21, 1971 to ALA Committee on Public Documents as reported in U.S. Library of Congress, Information Bulletin, July 15, 1971, pp. A133-A134.
6. U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Appropriations, Hearings, Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1973, 92d Congress, 2d session, 1972, p. 302.
7. U.S. Government Printing Office, Public Documents Department, Biennial Report of Depository Libraries, Report Series No. 11, October 15, 1971.

PART IV. DISPOSAL POLICY.

1. U.S. Government Printing Office, Division of Public Documents, Special Instruction to Regional Depositories: Disposition of Publications

by Depositories, November 7, 1962 (hereafter referred to as "Special Instruction to Regional Depositories, 1962).

2. Instructions to Depository Libraries, 1967, p. 11.

3. Biennial Report of Depository Libraries, 1971, question 51. Results of the response to this question was furnished by letter from the Superintendent of Documents, March 2, 1972.

4. Letter from Carper W. Buckley, Superintendent of Documents, Division of Public Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, November 26, 1969.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.

7. Ibid.

8. Robert M. Simmons, "Handling Changes in Superintendent of Documents Classification", LRTS 15: 241-244 (Spring 1971).

9. LeRoy C. Schwarzkopf, "In the Mail: More on SUDOCS", LRTS 16:95-97, (Winter 1972).

10. Sylvia Mechanic, Annotated List of Selected United States Government Publications Available to Depository Libraries (New York, H.W. Wilson, 1971) p. x.

PART V. INTERLIBRARY LOAN.

1. Senate Hearings, 1962, pp. 29 and 49.

2. Ibid., p. 49.

3. Instructions to Depository Libraries, 1967, p. 5.

PART VI. REFERENCE ASSISTANCE.

1. Letter from Robert E. Kling, Jr., Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Public Documents Department, March 2, 1972.

2. Interview, March 1972, at Public Documents Department, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

3. 44 U.S.C. 1905.

4. At the Illinois Documents Workshop, Chicago, Illinois on March 19, 1971 and at the Colloquium on Publishing in the Seventies, State University of New York at Albany on April 20, 1972. The testimony of Mr. Kling at the Legislative Branch Appropriations Hearings for Fiscal Year 1973 does not indicate he asked for funds to fully establish this program.

5. Sylvia Mechanic, op.cit.

6. Ibid., p. xiii.

7. Ibid.

8. These are Illinois and Maryland.
Yuri Nakata, "Profile of Federal Depository Libraries in Illinois", Illinois Libraries 53: 431-7 (June 1971). Depository
LeRoy C. Schwarzkopf, "Survey of Academic/Libraries in Maryland", unpublished term paper for Seminar in Academic Libraries, School of Library and Information Service, University of Maryland, 26 May 1969.

9. Elizabeth Howes and Mary Schell, editors, U.S. Government Publications Acquisition, Processing and Use; Proceedings of Three Workshops (Sacramento, California State Library, Government Publications Section, 1967, reprinted 1969) (GPS Publication 2)

10. Problems of Regional Depository Libraries; a Panel Discussion Held at Syracuse University on June 9, 1966 (Albany, New York State Library, 1967) (ED 021 600)
11. Illinois Libraries 53: 383-446 (June 1971). Entire issue is devoted to the federal government documents workshop held on March 19, 1971 in Chicago.
12. Ibid., pp. 383-384.

PART VII. FEDERAL SUPPORT.

1. House Hearings, 1958, pp. 30, 41, 50, 79, 83, 85, 87, 98, 106-107, 108, 183-184, 187, 202, and 208.
2. Ibid., p. 30, and 54.
3. Ibid., pp. 55-56.
4. Senate Hearings, 1962, pp. 60, 76.
5. Ibid., pp. 65-76.
6. Brock, op.cit., p. 198.
7. Problems of Regional Libraries; a Panel Discussion Held at Syracuse University on June 9, 1966, p. 1.
8. Instructions to Depository Libraries, 1967, p. 5 .

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE ON REGIONAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES

PART I - GENERAL

1. Name of Library:_____ 2. Location: _____

3. Date library became regional depository: _____

4. Does your area of responsibility include the entire state? _____

5. If no, explain why, and describe what division of responsibility has been made: _____

6. Are there any depositories of the executive departments or their major bureaus and offices, or of independent federal agencies located in your region?_____ If yes, please describe the services you provide to these depositories: _____

7. Describe your U.S. government documents collection (check a,b,or c):
a. separate___ b. integrated ___ c. separate,partially integrated___

8. If you checked c above, give a rough estimate of the number of titles in the separate and in the integrated parts of the collection, and the shelf space occupied by each in percentages (ex. Congressional Record is one title but occupies considerable amount of shelf space.

	titles	shelf space
a. in the separate collection.....	____%	____%
b. integrated in regular library collection...	____%	____%

PART II - RETENTION POLICY

The regional depository is considered to have the permanent collection for its region. Has this affected your retention policy for those categories of items which you are authorized to dispose of in accordance with Section 11 of the Superintendent of Documents Instructions to Depository Libraries?

9. Do you retain bills and resolutions more than one year beyond the close of the Congress?___If you answered no, do you get a microfilm edition of bills and resolutions?_____

10. Do you retain all, or part of the daily Congressional Record after the bound volumes have been received? _____

11. Do you retain advance copies of any of the following which are later superseded by bound volumes:
a. Congressional reports and documents (s/s by Serial Set)?_____
b. Slip laws (s/s by Statutes at Large)? _____
c. Treaties and Other International Acts (s/s by U.S.Treaties)?___
d. Preliminary census reports (s/s by final bound reports)?_____

12. Do you file loose leaf page changes?_____

13. Do you retain older editions of publications which have been revised or superseded by new editions? _____

14. Do you retain annual or biennial publications of a statistical nature which merely revise figures or information and bring them up to date? _____

15. Do you retain material which has an expiring-effect date, such as Civil Service examination announcements, self expiration date circulars, etc.?_____

16. Do you retain the daily House Calendar other than final volume?____

17. Do you have collections of U.S. government documents in microform?___

18. If you answered yes to question 17, do you discard the paper copy of documents which are reproduced in the microform edition?_____

PART III - DISPOSAL POLICY

In his Special Instruction to Regional Depositories dated November 7, 1962 the Superintendent of Documents offered guidelines and suggested that as a minimum a request for permission to discard should include "current item number, series title, and approximate extent of holdings."

19. Have you issued implementing instructions in the form of a guide, pamphlet, letter, etc. which has been distributed to your selective depositories?___ If yes, please enclose copy of directive.

20. Are you satisfied with a general list of the approximate holdings on the initial application, or do you initially require a detailed list by individual title or number publication in a series? ____

21. Do you first screen the list and take pieces which you wish to add to your collection, including duplicates? _____

22. Do you visit the library to inspect the items on the lists?____

23. Do you request the library to first attempt to find a taker for the publications in its local area? _____

24. Are lists circulated to all other depositories in the region? _____

25. Are lists of duplicates circulated out-of-state? ____ If yes, are these lists circulated by the regional? ____ or holding library?___

26. Do you maintain a want list of publications for your own and/or the selective depositories in your region? _____

27. Do you accept publications for which there have been no takers, in or out-of-state? _____

28. Do your selective depositories have a tendency to request disposal of publications on active items after holding them only five years, or are most requests for disposal on older publications or discontinued items? _____

29. Please provide statistics, if available for the past three years:

	1969	1970	1971
a. Number of lists submitted	___	___	___
b. Number of publications on these lists	___	___	___
c. Disposition of these publications:			
(1) accepted by regional	___	___	___
(2) transferred to libraries in vicinity of holder	___	___	___
(3) transferred to other libraries in region	___	___	___
(4) transferred to other libraries out-of-state ..	___	___	___
(5) destroyed	___	___	___
(6) sold as second hand books	___	___	___
(7) sold as waste paper	___	___	___
(8) other	___	___	___

30. Describe other policy and/or problems regarding disposal: _____

_____

PART IV - INTERLIBRARY LOAN

31. Are interlibrary loan requests for U.S. government documents processed by: Interlibrary Loan Office? ___ Documents Office? _____
If a combination of both, describe procedure: _____

32. Provide statistics, if available for the past three years:

	1969	1970	1971
a. Number of libraries submitting requests	___	___	___
b. Number of requests	___	___	___
c. Number of pieces loaned	___	___	___
d. Number of requests not filled (policy)	___	___	___
e. Number of requests not filled (not in collection)	___	___	___

33. What restrictions, if any, do you place on interlibrary loans (clientelle, loan period, type of material, etc.)? Please describe:

_____

34. Do you circulate materials locally?___ If yes, please describe loan policy, and any restrictions on loans: _____

35. Have you augmented your resources to provide interlibrary loans (duplicates, microforms, etc.)? If yes, please describe: _____

_____

36. What type of materials do you lack in your collection to satisfy unfilled interlibrary loan requests? _____

NOTE: PLEASE PLACE ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON THE REVERSE SIDE, OR ON A SEPARATE SHEET OF PAPER.

PART V - REFERENCE ASSISTANCE

37. In his Bienniel Survey, the Superintendent of Documents asked if you made periodic visits to depositories in your region. How many depositories have you visited since your library became a regional?_____

38. How many depositories have you visited during the past two years: within 0-25 mile radius?___ 26-50 mile radius?____ 51-100 mile radius?___ 101-150 mile radius?___ over 150 mile radius?____

39. What was the purpose of the visits? What assistance was given?

40. Please provide statistics, if available for the past three years:

	1969	1970	1971
a. Number of telephone requests received	____	____	____
b. Number of letters received	____	____	____

41. What type of reference assistance was provided on phone and letter requests? _____

42. Do you assist new depositories in selecting items? _____

43. Have you made a survey of the selective depositories in your region? If yes, please provide copy, or indicate how it may be obtained.

44. Have you conducted or sponsored any workshops, seminars, conferences, or similar events for the depositories in your region? ___ If yes, please indicate date(s), place(s), type of even(s), and number of participants for each: _____

45. If they are available, please furnish copies of announcements, schedules, proceedings, or other reports of these events. If they have been published, please provide citation(s), and/or indicate where they can be obtained. _____

46. Do you issue a newsletter or similar announcement to inform your depositories about the program, or about specific publications, series, or items?___ If yes, please describe and/or send copy.

47. What other assistance do you provide to depositories? _____

PART VI - FEDERAL SUPPORT

48. When the regionals were first proposed it was often expressed that a depository would not accept the responsibility of a regional without federal support. What additional resources have you added,or expended due to your designation as a regional (personel, space, collections, etc.)?_____

49. Do you feel that the federal government should furnish additional support to the regional?____ If yes, what kind (travel money, duplicate copies, microform, etc.)?_____

APPENDIX B - NUMBER OF DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES AS OF APRIL 1972

	Academic				Publ	State		Exec	Ind		Vacancies	
	Univ	Coll	J.C.	LawS	Lib	Lib	Spec	Dept	Agy	TOTAL	Sen	Rep
Ala.	9	5	3	1	3	2	-	1	-	24	-	1
Alaska	2	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	5	2	1
Ariz.	3	1	1	-	3	1	-	-	-	9	1	2
Ark.	4	8	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	14	-	1
Calif.	15	22	-	4	37	1	2	2	1	84	-	4
Colo.	4	6	1	-	3	1	-	2	-	17	-	-
Conn.	4	4	-	-	4	1	3	1	-	17	-	3
Del.	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	5	2	2
D.C.	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	17	4	24	-	1
Fla.	14	3	3	-	9	1	-	-	-	30	-	2
Ga.	6	8	1	1	5	1	-	-	-	22	-	4
Hawaii	2	2	1	-	3	1	1	-	-	10	-	-
Idaho	2	4	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	9	-	1
Ill.	15	12	-	2	9	1	3	-	-	42	-	14
Ind.	14	6	-	1	7	1	-	-	-	29	-	2
Iowa	4	5	-	1	5	1	-	-	-	16	-	4
Kan.	5	4	1	2	1	2	-	-	-	15	-	1
Ky.	6	5	-	1	2	2	-	-	-	16	-	4
La.	13	4	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	21	1	1
Maine	1	4	-	1	2	1	1	-	-	10	1	-
Md.	3	6	1	1	2	1	-	2	1	17	1	7
Mass.	7	8	-	-	9	1	2	-	-	27	-	6
Mich.	10	11	2	2	14	2	1	1	-	43	-	5
Minn.	3	8	-	-	7	2	-	-	-	20	-	2
Miss.	3	4	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	10	2	5
Mo.	7	10	-	1	4	2	-	-	-	24	-	4
Mont.	2	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	6	2	2
Neb.	3	5	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	11	1	-
Nev.	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	3	2
N.H.	1	5	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	8	1	1
N.J.	8	8	-	-	16	1	-	-	-	33	-	6
N.M.	4	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	7	1	2
N.Y.	20	28	2	-	13	1	2	2	-	68	-	27
N.Car.	14	10	-	-	4	1	-	-	-	29	-	1
N.Dak.	2	3	-	-	2	3	-	-	-	10	-	-
Ohio	19	15	-	1	14	1	-	-	-	50	-	10
Okla.	7	6	-	-	3	1	-	1	-	18	-	3
Ore.	5	6	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	14	-	1
Pa.	8	18	3	1	15	1	-	1	-	47	-	15
R.I.	2	2	-	-	3	1	-	1	-	9	-	2
S.Car.	3	10	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	17	-	2
S.Dak.	2	5	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	9	-	-
Tenn.	11	4	-	1	3	1	-	-	-	20	1	4
Tex.	25	9	3	1	8	1	-	-	-	47	-	7
Utah	4	3	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	9	-	1
Ve.	2	5	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	8	-	-
Va.	6	11	2	1	3	1	-	2	-	26	1	3
Wash.	3	5	-	1	6	1	-	-	-	16	1	3
W.Va.	2	8	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	13	-	4
Wisc.	12	3	-	-	9	3	1	-	-	28	-	-
Wyo.	1	3	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	7	1	-
Terr.	3	-	-	-	3	-	-	1	-	7	-	-
TOTAL	329	326	29	27	249	63	16	35	6	1080	22	173
		711						41			195	

APPENDIX C - NUMBER OF NEW DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES 1962-1972

State	Academic				Publ	State		Exec	Ind	
	Univ	Coll	J.C.	LawS	Lib	Lib	Spec	Dept	Agy	TOTAL
Ala.	5	1	3	1	2	-	-	1	-	13
Alaska	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	3
Ariz.	-	1	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	4
Ark.	1	4	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	6
Calif.	7	16	-	3	21	-	2	2	1	52
Colo.	2	2	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	7
Conn.	1	2	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	7
Del.	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
D.C.	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	8	3	13
Fla.	8	2	3	-	6	-	-	-	-	19
Ga.	4	4	1	1	3	-	-	-	-	13
Hawaii	1	2	1	-	3	-	1	-	-	8
Idaho	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	3
Ill.	5	5	-	2	3	-	1	-	-	16
Ind.	7	3	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	12
Iowa	1	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	4
Kan.	-	1	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	5
Ky.	1	2	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	5
La.	6	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
Maine	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	2
Md.	1	3	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	8
Mass.	3	4	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	11
Mich.	4	11	1	2	4	1	-	1	-	24
Minn.	1	4	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	7
Miss.	-	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	4
Mo.	1	4	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	8
Mont.	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Neb.	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Nev.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
N.H.	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	4
N.J.	3	7	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	20
N.M.	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
N.Y.	9	16	2	-	4	-	-	1	-	32
N.Car.	6	6	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	15
N.Dak.	-	1	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	4
Ohio	11	8	-	1	4	-	-	-	-	24
Okla.	1	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	5
Ore.	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	6
Pa.	3	10	3	1	8	-	-	1	-	26
R.I.	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	4
S.Car.	1	7	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	11
S.Dak.	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	4
Tenn.	4	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	9
Tex.	9	9	3	1	1	-	-	-	-	23
Utah	1	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	5
Ve.	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Va.	2	2	2	1	2	-	-	2	-	11
Was.	-	4	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	7
W.Va.	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	4
Wisc.	5	2	-	-	4	1	-	-	-	12
Wyo.	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
*Terr.	1	-	-	-	3	-	-	1	-	5
TOTAL	121	185	27	25	108	9	7	22	5	509
			358						27	

* Canal Zone, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands

APPENDIX D
LIST OF REGIONAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES

ALABAMA - University of Alabama Library, University, Ala.
ARIZONA - Department of Library and Archives, Phoenix, Ariz.
- University of Arizona Library, Tucson, Ariz.
CALIFORNIA - California State Library, Sacramento, Calif.
COLORADO - University of Colorado Libraries, Boulder, Colo.
- Denver Public Library, Denver, Colo.
(NOTE: also temporarily serving the state of Wyoming)
CONNECTICUT - Connecticut State Library, Hartford, Conn.
FLORIDA - University of Florida Libraries, Gainesville, Fla.
IDAHO - University of Idaho Library, Moscow, Idaho
ILLINOIS - Illinois State Library, Springfield, Ill.
INDIANA - Indiana State Library, Indianapolis, Ind.
IOWA - University of Iowa Library, Iowa City, Ia.
KENTUCKY - University of Kentucky, Margaret L. King Library, Lexington, Ky.
LOUISIANA - Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Prescott Memorial Library, Ruston, La.
- Louisiana State University Library, Baton Rouge, La.
MAINE - University of Maine, Raymond H. Fogler Library, Orono, Me.
(NOTE: also serves the states of New Hampshire and Vermont
MARYLAND - University of Maryland, McKeldin Library, College Park, Md.
MASSACHUSETTS - State Library of Massachusetts, Boston, Mass.
MICHIGAN - Michigan State Library, Lansing, Mich.
- Detroit Public Library, Detroit, Mich.
MINNESOTA - University of Minnesota, Wilson Library, Minneapolis, Minn.
MONTANA - University of Montana Library, Missoula, Mont.
NEVADA - University of Nevada Library, Reno, Nev.
NEW JERSEY - Newark Public Library, Newark, N.J.
NEW MEXICO - University of New Mexico, Zimmerman Library, Albuquerque, N.M.
- New Mexico State Library, Santa Fe, N.M.
NEW YORK - New York State Library, Albany, N.Y.
NORTH CAROLINA - University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill, N.C.
NORTH DAKOTA - North Dakota University Library, Fargo, N.D.
(NOTE: in cooperation with University of North Dakota, Chester Fritz Library, Grand Forks, N.D.
OHIO - Ohio State Library, Columbus, Ohio
OKLAHOMA - Oklahoma Department of Libraries, Oklahoma City, Okla.
OREGON - Portland State University Library, Portland, Ore.
PENNSYLVANIA - Pennsylvania State Library, Harrisburg, Pa.
TEXAS - Texas State Library, Austin, Tex.
- Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Tex.
UTAH - Utah State University, Merrill Library, Logan, Utah
VIRGINIA- University of Virginia, Alderman Library, Charlottesville, Va.
WASHINGTON - Washington State Library, Olympia, Wash.
WEST VIRGINIA - West Virginia University Library, Morgantown, W.Va.
WISCONSIN - Milwaukee Public Library, Milwaukee, Wisc.
- State Historical Society Library, Madison, Wisc.
(NOTE: in cooperation with University of Wisconsin, Memorial Library, Madison, Wis.